DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 493 HE 027 453

AUTHOR Young, Raymond J.; McDougall, William P.
TITLE Summer Sessions in Colleges and Universities: Perspectives, Practices, Problems, and Prospects.
INSTITUTION North American Association of Summer Sessions, St. Louis, MO.
SPONS AGENCY Phi Delta Kappa, Bloomington, Ind.; Washington State Univ., Pullman. Coll. of Agriculture.; Western Association of Summer Session Administrators.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 318p.
AVAILABLE FROM North American Association of Summer Sessions, 11728 Summerhaven Dr., St. Louis, MO 63146 ($8.50).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Programs; *Educational History; *Educational Practices; Higher Education; *Program Administration; Program Development; School Schedules; Summer Programs; *Summer Schools; Universities

ABSTRACT

This book offers normative information about various operational facets of collegiate summer activities, places the role of the modern day collegiate summer session in evolutionary perspective, and provides baseline information produced by four national studies and one regional study. The book's chapters focus on: (1) a global perspective and orientation to the topic of collegiate summer sessions and a research review; (2) the historical of the evolution of summer sessions; (3) various features of summer terms, including organization and administration, curriculum and instructional activities, students, and staff; (4) historical development and influence of the collegiate calendar and its relationship to summer sessions; (5) historical development, role, nature, and contribution of professional associations relating to summer sessions; (6) major problems, issues, and trends regarding collegiate summer sessions; and (7) evaluation of summer sessions. An appendix provides a brief program evaluation proposal. (Contains approximately 300 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED 370 493

SUMMER SESSIONS

IN

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

PERSPECTIVES

PRACTICES

PROBLEMS

PROSPECTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael U. Nelson
North American Assoc. of Summer Sessions
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES NFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE027 453

RAYMOND J. YOUNG

WILLIAM P. McDOUGALL

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMER SESSIONS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: PERSPECTIVES, PRACTICES, PROBLEMS, AND PROSPECTS

By

RAYMOND J. YOUNG AND WILLIAM P. McDOUGALL

Distributed by the

NORTH AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SUMMER SESSIONS

11728 Summerhaven Drive
St. Louis, MO 63146

Raymond J. Young is Professor, Emeritus, Department of Educational Administration, College of Education, Washington State University and William P. McDougall is Professor, Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling, College of Education, Washington State University and Director of Summer Session Washington State University.

Copyright 1991 Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall. All Rights Reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 90-63464

PREFACE

A purpose of this book was to update the seminal work published over two decades ago, The American University in Summer, authored by Clarence A. Schoenfeld with Donald N. Zillman. Another purpose was to place the role of the modern day collegiate summer session/term in evolutionary perspective in view of numerous historical trends and developments which gave rise to and impacted its development and character. A third purpose was to provide a useful resource of baseline information on this important segment of collegiate operation for scholars, researchers, practitioners, and students of higher education.

It is hoped that this book will for the first time provide in one place information both scattered in diverse locations and gathered during the 1980s decade from field sources to enhance the fund of knowledge possessed by scholars and students of higher education. It is hoped also that the baseline information produced by four studies of national and one of regional scope can and will be used by researchers in further exploration and theory construction. Practitioners will undoubtedly find the normative information about various operational facets of collegiate summer activities of comparative and suggestive interest. Some of the contents are based upon comprehensive studies of public and private research, doctoral granting, and comprehensive universities, public and private liberal arts colleges, and public two-year colleges with head count credit enrollments exceeding 1,500 students.

The preparation of a book of this magnitude has involved the cooperation of many individuals and created a deep sense of gratitude and indebtedness to each. The cooperation of hundreds of collegiate administrators, including deans, presidents, and those responsible for planning and implementing summer-time educational programs and activities, in providing information is acknowledged. Collegiate authorities of specifically named universities who provided documentary information on request or who gave of their time for interviews deserve special thanks. Appreciation is expressed to members of the Executive Committees and Joint Committee on Research of the North American Association of Summer Sessions (NAASS) and the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators (WASSA) for their interest and provision of funds for conducting several of the studies. Funds were also provided by Phi Delta Kappa International and the College of Education, Washington State University. Without the formal endorsement and active support of the National University Continuing Education Association

(NUCEA), the high rate of participation in one of the national studies by collegiate administrators of public and private institutions would not have been possible.

Although it is risky to single out specific individuals for their contributions for fear of neglecting someone, special recognition is made of contributions by John R. Little, University of Colorado-Boulder, Director of Summer Sessions, retired, who provided a wealth of information and critiqued Chapter 9. Elbert H. Himes, Utah State University, Director of Summer Sessions, retired, also contributed materials utilized. James C. Quann, Registrar, Washington State University, critiqued the contents of Chapter 8 on the collegiate calendar and provided substantial suggestions. To Nancy Abraham, Associate Dean, Division of Summer Sessions and Intercollegiate Programs, University of Wisconsin-Madison, go thanks for historical materials provided from the files. For his penetrating, insightful critique of the book in rough draft and suggestions, special gratitude and appreciation are expressed to Clarence A. Schoenfeld, Emeritus Dean of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, who also prepared the Foreword.

For his patience and continued constructive criticism of all manuscript materials, his assistance in locating funding sources, his conduct of the study on which Chapter 10 "Problems, Issues, and Trends" was based, and for the authorship of Chapter 11 "Evaluation of Summer Term Programs and Activities, deep and sincere heartfelt gratitude and appreciation are expressed to William P. McDougall, Professor, Department of Counseling Psychology, College of Education and Director Washington State University Summer Session. Responsibility for the authorship and content of the remaining portions reside with Raymond J. Young, Professor Emeritus, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, College of Education, Washington State University. Special acknowledgment and appreciation are expressed to Ms. Sandra Tyacke, School of Architecture, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, who word-processed the many versions of the developing manuscript. Finally, appreciation is expressed to Ms. Jean Chaput Welch, Office of Summer School, Simmons College, Boston, Massachusetts, who prepared the manuscript in its final format.

FOREWORD

Using their expertise as respected students and practitioners of the science and art of higher education administration, with this book Professors Young and McDougall accomplish what nobody has ever been able to do before--vault college and university summer session perspectives, practices, problems, and prospects onto the agenda of campus chief executive officers. With nice amalgam of quantitative precision and qualitative insight not always found in words of this genre, the authors make signal contributions to the regimen of educational research, to the nuts-and-bolts of summer term operations, and to explorations of the ever-developing philosophies that are the wonder and redemption of American higher education.

Unraveling the strange case of the summer session is no small task. At the outset, Young and McDougall give the life to the hoary myth that each summer every American college and university "takes up the campus sidewalks," so to speak, not to revive until autumn. In point of fact, institutions of higher education are very lively places in summer today. This secret life of the summer session may be attributed in part to the strange nature of the summer term, as the authors point out.

The summer term is the hybrid of the academic world. On the one hand, the summer session is simply an extension of the teaching function into the summer months; most summer students enrolled for credit are indigenous undergraduates and graduates pursuing their education year-round. Accompanying the regular campus classes is a kaleidoscope of non-credit institutes, conferences, and workshops; at least at universities devoted to public service, more individuals come to the campus in summer than in any other three-month period of the year. On the other hand, the summer term is a major research laboratory; at least at land-grant universities the June-August research budget is apt to be greater than the September-November budget. Add an array of cultural and recreational out-of-class activities, and the summer campus takes on some of the trappings of a resort.

Through instruction in a wide range of courses, through varied public services, through research and productive scholarship, and through ambient co-curricular programs, the summer term carries on the work of the university around the calendar and adds to that work in a number of unique ways--the whole enterprise representing "a responsibility for academic traditions and standards as well as a responsiveness to public needs," the words of S. S. Dean Emeritus Norman Sam of Lehigh, past president of the North American Association of Summer Sessions.

Attuned as they were to the demands of the agricultural cycle, the first college campuses were indeed ghost towns in summer; but in the years following the Civil War a concatenation of empty facilities and school teachers eager to upgrade themselves produced the first "summer institutes." Arranged by entrepreneurial professors, they were at but not of the university. It was not until the 20th century that the summer term was officially adopted by its host institution. Some of that tradition as an academic appendage lingers on in the summer term today, Young and McDougall explicate. For example, while no college or university has a "first-semester" or "second quarter" dean, it will invariably designate a special chief administrator for the summer term, typically called the summer session dean or director. Furthermore, the institution will encourage if not demand that the summer term be self-supporting. For instance, when the Regents of the University of Minnesota in 1877 authorized "special summer courses of instruction during the summer vacations," they specified that "no material expense be incurred thereby." Minnesota Emeritus Director Willard L. Thompson calls this a "pure case of original sin, one that we have persisted in through the years."

What exactly "self-support" means today depends on the institution. At a minimum, it will mean that student fees pay for all direct instructional costs. Or it can mean that summer fees cover a fair share of overhead costs as well. At a maximum, self-support can mean contributing a clear profit to the institution's capital fund. Whatever its extent, there is a good deal of fall-out from the self-support syndrome, as the authors point out. Insulated as it is from regular public or private appropriations, the summer session tends to be much more "market oriented" than is the so-called regular academic year. For example, the term "summer session" is really a misnomer. While it is true, of course, that there will usually be one main session, either a six-week term, an eight-week half-semester, or a full 10- or 12-week quarter, the typical college or university will have not one buy many summer sessions as it seeks to meet the varying calendar conveniences of varying clientele.

Market demands are reflected sharply in the summer term curriculum as well. The credit course array will represent a solid block of "sure bet" offerings from the fall or spring timetable, as well as a sprinkling of experimental offerings designed to serve mercurial student tastes or emerging fields of scholarship. Particularly, there typically will be a deliberate attempt to attract public school teachers back to the campus. The more enduring experiments find their way into the regular-year inventory. A long roster of courses, programs, departments, and even disciplines, first saw the light of day in summer.

To bring the summer curriculum to public attention, "marketing has been a traditional concern of directors of summer sessions," as Vice President Eleanor McMahon of Rhode Island College once put it. Way back in 1889, the UW-Madison Summer Session Prospectus waxed eloquent thusly: "The Summer School aims to do earnest, vigorous work, but while seeking especially the patronage of those who spend the summer in this way, it affords also rare opportunities for those who seek a delightful summer resort for rest and enjoyment." (The author, incidentally, was a young historian, Frederick Jackson Turner, who four years later was to electrify the scholarly world with his "frontier theory" of American history.) While the Madison Avenue tenor of such marketing is considerably muted today, the summer session dean continues to invest heavily in a "media mix" of folders, posters, bulletins, fliers, radio-TV scripts, new releases, and journal advertisements. When a pioneer group of summer session deans held their first national meeting in 1917, at the top of the agenda for discussion was "the best methods of securing publicity." When members of the same organization got together at Chapel Hill, North Carolina recently, still on the agenda was the question: "What advertising or promotion programs generally prove to be the most successful?"--posed not by a representative of Siwash but by Dean Richard D. Robbins of Johns Hopkins.

As they scramble for "non-traditional" students to buttress conventional student populations in fall, college and university recruiters have a ready-made field manual in the files of their summer session deans. The Reverend Robert J. Austgen of Notre Dame called his fellow summer session deans, "the most ecologically minded of all administrators in academe," in that, unlike their regular-year counterparts, they have not been guilty of "mono-cultivating" the traditional college student but rather have been ahead of time in "tapping the trend to lifelong learning." Helen B. Warren of Pennsylvania State once observed: "In the time-honored tradition of reinvention, recent literature of higher education has been replete with proposals for the extension of learning opportunities in time and place and to nontraditional clienteles. In fact, summer study in institutions of higher learning has been doing just that for over 100 years."

Inevitably, the do-it-yourself financing of the summer term impacts on faculty salary scales, Young and McDougall find. While there is a bewildering range in standards of summer payment throughout the country, repeated studies indicate that the typical faculty member in summer works a littler harder at his or her teaching for a given amount of money than he or she does in spring or fall. In a worst-case scenario, a professor may not get paid at all if the course doesn't "make"--that is, meet some minimum enrollment requirements. In the best of situations, even with a guaranteed summer salary based on an "equitable" proportion of the nine-month salary, a summer faculty member's teaching load will tend to involve proportionately more credit hours than in spring or fall. As a matter of fact, Michael Nelson, Executive Secretary of the North American Association of Summer Sessions, thinks the very existence of any "equitable" summer session salary is "open to debate."

Tenured or not, no faculty member has an inalienable right to teach in summer as he or she does in fall and spring. The summer budget is zero-based, the whole staff technically taken apart each August and put together from scratch the following May. Practically, of course, those faculty members who choose to do so and who have successful track records appear on the summer rosters perennially. A promise of summer employment is often a faculty recruitment or retention device. Where summer service contributes to retirement benefits, senior faculty like to teach. Given the fact that the summer professor has elected to teach during the summer, evidently enjoys teaching, is often more skilled and experienced, and that other academic duties frequently weigh less heavily upon him or her than during the regular year, one might assume that he or she does an effective job of teaching. Such indeed seems to be the case. Repeated surveys of summer session students at diverse institutions invariably find that summer instruction is rated at least as good if not better than a fall or spring experience. (Such favorable responses may be attributed in part to the fact that the summer student can concentrate on one or two courses and thus invest more undivided attention in the learning process.)

The myth of the athlete repairing a bent grade-point average to the contrary, the summer student tends to be a serious scholar. He or she is more apt to be married and in graduate school--hence older, motivation stronger, goals clearer. Invariably the summer student will have a part-time job. This is not to say, of course, that some summer students are not the playboys of the Western world, but the absence of football and frolics tends to keep their numbers to a minimum on the summer campus, according to Young and McDougall data. Few summer term credit student enrollments reach 50 percent of the spring term enrollment. There might be more students in summer if more financial aid were available; but many campus financial aid officials actually discourage students from attending, recommending instead that they seek summer employment to shore up their resources for fall. But in recent years more and more students seem to recognize that it may make economic sense to accelerate in summer. As Robert Chernak of the University of Hartford says, "They know that inflation will go up and tuition will go up, so they want to finish as early as they can and get into the job market as soon as they can."

Cheek by jowl with the regular student taking regular courses on the summer campus is that almost indescribable body of youths and adults attending all manner of non-credit institutes, conferences and workshops--from bandsters bused in from nearby junior highs to a worldwide assemblage of high-energy physicists. Last summer, for example, UW-Madison hosted over 30,000 individuals in over 500 different programs with registrations ranging from eight to 800. In contrast to the midway atmosphere of the summer term as a continuing education enterprise is the silent role of the summer campus as the site of ongoing research. Particularly in those institutions with agricultural experiment stations, research activities actually peak in summer. In other well subsidized fields as well, summer research grants are common. Research professors and their acolytes scarcely break step from month to month. Some universities actively discourage junior faculty from teaching in summer--the better to advance their careers as published scholars. Eager students in juxtaposition with able professors, third-graders in a "college for kids" and senior citizens in an "elderhostel," scholars sifting and winnowing for new insights, the whole enterprise set in the halcyon days of summer--the summer term perhaps has now "come of age" as "a multipurpose institution serving a varied clientele," in the words of Missouri's Dean Emeritus Larry Clarke.

Prior to Young and McDougall, no one has described the strange case of the summer session better than Dean Emeritus Marion Marts of the University of Washington:

> Summer sessions have certain characteristics which distinguish them from the academic year programs, and which lend them a significance that is not widely recognized. They represent under-utilized instructional and societal resources whose development can reduce the year-round unit costs of higher education. They are teaching-oriented, through a process of self-selection by faculty and students. They have a proportionately large impact on public school education because of the number of school personnel in the summer student body. They represent significant opportunities for enrichment, experimentation, and innovation because of the ease with which instructional resources can be assembled in the absence of tenure and other long-term commitments. They tend to operate on a 'market model' because their financing is sensitive to enrollment and is not insulated by big appropriations or endowments.

Given such a mission, the summer session dean tends to be, the authors find, a strange breed of campus cat. While he or she will usually bring to the post a respectable background as a scholar, that robe is shed in favor of the uniform of a battalion commander or the pin-stripe suit of a bond salesman, so unorthodox are the responsibilities of what Minnesota's former Summer Dean E. W. Ziebarth once called "bringing into harmony the dissonant variations on an educational theme." In one respect, however, summer sessions deans are ever so conventional--they have their own association. In fact, they have four of them. The oldest and most prestigious, the Association of University Summer Sessions, limits its membership to 50 leading universities, from Harvard to Michigan to Berkeley. The North American Association of Summer Sessions has over 400 members, representing apples and oranges. Then there are North Central and Western associations as well.

When summer deans get together, their deliberations are understandably a far cry from the agenda of the Modern Language Association or the American Society of Agronomy. A frequent topic is "those people who don't understand us." For some reason or other, summer session deans habitually feel put upon. University of Minnesota Emeritus Director Thompson enumerates typical complaints: "Recalcitrant department heads and faculty whose only concern in the summer is with additional paychecks. The limits placed on innovative efforts by the need to be self-supporting. The frustrations of summer session deans and directors who could work wonders if they weren't so far down in the administrative pecking order."

Young management consultants unfamiliar with the realities of the summer term sometimes will recommend that the summer session be decapitated as an economy measure, only to discover upon close examination that savings are illusionary. Some troglodyte faculty continue to insist that anything taught in a shorter time frame than three or four months is ipso-facto shoddy, conveniently ignoring repeated studies showing no statistical difference in learning to be related to number of weeks of instruction. Some research professors express concern at the "academic drug-store" nature of all those summer conferences and workshops, and some citizens in attendance therein may well wonder what those research professors are doing with the public's money out in a sun-baked cornfield or in an air-conditioned library. Young and McDougall say that actually, more than ever before, summer sessions are serving as "early warning devices," providing a testing ground for new markets and new market strategies which can be transferred into the academic year.

All told then, the summer term today can be said to be a significant, albeit strange, device which every American college and university can each in its own way employ to help attain changing institution goals. For many, that could presage summer enterprise--in the words of a founding dean--"as broad as human endeavor and as high as human aspirations." If college and university presidents and chancellors--and their summer session deans and directors--don't rise to the challenge of the summer session, it won't be because authors Young and McDougall have not supplied them with sure guidelines to perspectives and prospects. I for one an confident that enough campus CEOs and their summer school staff officers will assimilate the message of this book in such a way that the summer term will proceed to the broader lands and fairer days warranted by its past performance, present professors, and future potential.

Clarence A. (Clay) Schoenfeld
Emeritus Dean of Summer Sessions
and Inter-College Programs,
University of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wisconsin

Dr. Schoenfeld is also Emeritus Professor of Journalism and Mass Communication, and Emeritus Professor Environmental Studies, The University of Wisconsin-Madison; Founding Chair, The American Summer Sessions Senate; Past President, the North Central Conference of Summer Schools, and The Association of University Summer Sessions; Honorary Life Member, the North American Association of Summer Sessions; Senior Author, The American University in Summer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

FOREWORD v

TABLE OF CONTENTS xiii

LIST OF TABLES xix

Chapter Page

1. Overview of Collegiate Summer Sessions in the United States 1

    Introduction 1
    Map of Contents and Design 2
    Perspectives Regarding Summer Sessions. 3
    Relationship of Summer Session to Extension, Continuing Education, Community Service, and Extended Education 4
        Extension 4
        Continuing/Community Service 5
        Extended Education 7
        Organizational Structures 7
        Connections with Summer Sessions 8
    Relationship to Institutional Goals 10
    Objectives to Summer Session 12
        Objectives in 1930 12
        Changes in Objectives By the 1960s 14
        Objectives in the 1980s 15
    Sketch of Research on Summer Sessions 17

2. Contextual Environment for Collegiate Summer Study Before 1900 25

    Introduction 25
    Formal Educational Antecedents 25
        Common School Developments 25
        Development of Collegiate Education 27
            University Extension 28
        Development of Teacher Education 30
            Normal Schools 30
            Teachers' Institutes 32
            University Departments of Education 33
            Development of Teachers Colleges 33

- Non-Formal Educational Antecedents ... 34
  - Lyceum ... 34
  - Chautauqua ... 35
  - Organizations for Educational Purposes ... 36
  - Reform and Quality ... 37
- Evolution of Summer Schools ... 38
  - The University of Chicago Innovation ... 41
- Summary of Educational Development Prior to the Twentieth Century ... 41

3. The Era of Educational Growth and Expansion ... 47

- Introduction ... 47
- Demographic Changes ... 47
- Educational Trends ... 48
  - Elementary and Secondary Schools ... 48
  - Higher Education ... 50
- Adult Education ... 51
  - Characteristics of Adult Participants ... 51
  - Agencies for Adult Education ... 53
  - Factors Contributing to Increased Interest ... 54
  - Implications for Summer Sessions ... 55
- Education for Teachers ... 55
  - Factors Affecting the Need for Trained Teachers ... 55
  - Quality of Teacher Education in the Early 1900s ... 57
  - Teacher Certification and Licensure ... 59
- Collective Bargaining and Negotiation ... 62
- Teacher Preparation and Qualifications in the 1980s ... 64
- Growth of Summer Sessions ... 68
  - Trends in Summer Session Growth to 1920 ... 67
  - Growth of Summer Sessions 1920-1960 ... 68
  - Status of Summer Sessions in 1960 ... 69
  - Summer Sessions Since 1960 ... 70
  - Summer Session Prospects ... 72
- Summary of Educational Growth/Expansion ... 74

4. Organization and Administration of Summer Sessions ... 79

- Evolution of Summer Administration to 1960 ... 79
- Status of Summer Administration in 1960 ... 80
  - Source of Administrators ... 80
  - Time Allocations ... 80
  - Use of Advisory Committees ... 81
  - Role of Instructional Unit Chairperson ... 81
  - Financing Summer Sessions ... 82
    - Self-Support Budgets ... 83

Relation of Student Fees, Scholarships and Research 83
Summer Sessions in the 1980s 84
Philosophical Moorings 85
Policies and Procedures 85
Purposes of Summer Sessions 86
Organizational Structure 78
Operational Functioning Mode for Programming 90
Financing Summer Sessions 91
Financial Self-Sufficiency, Self-Support 92
Some Pro and Con Considerations Regarding Financial Support 94
Budget Administration and Allocations 96
Summer Session Administrators 98
Educational and Work Background 98
Provisions for Administrative Leadership 100
Other Responsibilities of Summer Administrators 101
Powers and Functions of Summer Session Administrators 102
Problems Related to Summer Term/Session 105
Importance of Problems Experienced 105
Relationship of Problems and Career Patterns of Administrators 106
Conclusions Regarding Problems Cited 107
Summary 107

5. Summer Curriculums and Instructional Activities 111

Summer Session Offerings in the Early 1930s 111
Novel Features 111
Travel Courses 111
Summer Session Camps 112
Summer Branches 113
Biological Laboratories 113
Training for Outdoor Leadership 114
Music and Art Activities 114
Summer Programs for Special Groups 115
Institutes 116
Conferences 117
Interinstitutional Cooperation 117
Summer Session Offerings in the 1960s 117
Non-Formal Classroom Activities 119
Workshops and Institutes 119
Travel Study Tours 119
Statistical Indices of Summer Session Program Characteristics 120
An Era of Expansion 122
Changing Summer Scene 122
Special Purpose Activities for Special Groups 124
Outreach for Minority and Disadvantaged Persons 124

Institutes for Special Groups 125
Summer Sessions Since 1975 127
Disadvantaged and Gifted 127
Elderhostel 128
Alumni Colleges 129
Other Summer Activities for Senior Citizens 129
Major Programs for College Faculty Development 130
Local Community Service 131
Programming Expectations for the 1980s 131
Special Groups Served 132
Regular Summer Session Activities 133
Trends in Regular Academic Program Offerings 134
Creativity in Summer Programming 135
Summary 136

6. Summer Term Students 143

Introduction 143
Descriptions of Summer Students to 1960 144
Level of Work 145
Reasons for Summer Attendance 146
Relationships of Summer and Fall Term Enrollments 149
Summer Session Students in Selected Institutions 152
Washington State University 152
University of Minnesota 154
University of Virginia 155
University of Wisconsin 155
North Carolina State University 157
The Pennsylvania State University 157
University of Alberta 157
Summary 158

7. Instructional Staff for Summer Terms 163

Introduction 163
Faculty Qualifications to 1960 163
Recent Summer Faculty Profile 166
Institution A 166
Institution B 167
National Faculty Profiles 168
Summer Faculty Selection 170
Faculty Motivations and Perceptions Regarding Summer Session Teaching 171
Faculty Remuneration 172
Methods of Determining Faculty Salaries 173
Rates of Remuneration 173

Salary Structures 174
Collective Bargaining 175
Summer Faculty Morale 175
Summary 177

8. The Collegiate Academic Calendar 181

Introduction 181
Historical Background 182
Trends in Types of Academic Calendars 183
Factors Influencing Academic Calendars 186
Year-Round Academic Calendars 188
Rationale for Year-Round Calendars 188
Problems and Requirements 190
Search for the Best Calendar 192
Relationship of Collegiate Calendar to Summer Session 193
Summer Term Calendars 194
Credit Standards 196
Questions for Pondering About Summer Sessions 197
Summary 197

9. Professional Associations for Summer Session Administrators 203

Introduction 203
Association of University Summer Sessions 203
The Founding 203
Developments to 1945 206
Post-World War II Meetings 208
Birth of a New Organization 208
Western Association of Summer Session Administrators 210
The Beginning 210
Coming of Age 210
Advent of Formal Organization 213
Program Emphases Since 1970 216
North Central Conference on Summer Schools 218
Birth of NCCSS 218
Nature of the Organization 218
Major Activities 219
North American Association of Summer Sessions 221
American Summer Sessions Senate 222
Beginnings 222
The ASSS Grows 224
CADESS 226
Summary 227

10. Problems, Issues, and Trends 231

Introduction 231
Problems 231
Issues 233
    Issue of Institutionalization/Philosophical Mooring 234
    Issues Relating to Funding/Budgeting 235
    Issues Regarding Organization 236
    Issues Relating to Program 236
Trends and Projections 237
    Students and Programs 238
    Organization and Administration 239
Presidents' Expectation of Summer Session 240
Prospects 242
Summary 244

11. Evaluation of Summer Term Programs and Activities 247

Historical Antecedents 248
The Contemporary Scene 249
Definition of Terms and Concepts Relating to Program Evaluation 250
Purposes of Evaluation 252
    Program Evaluation for Instructional Improvement 254
    Program Evaluation for Accountability Purposes 255
    Evaluation for Planning and Resource Allocation 256
    Summary of Criteria for Purposes 257
Approach to the Evaluation Process 258
Evaluation Models 260
The Evaluation Process 263
    General Principles 263
    Purpose 264
    Unit of Study 264
    Plan of Operation 264
    Evaluation Design 265
    Information and Instrumentation 266
    Assembling and Interpreting Results 268
    Reporting 268
    Verification 269
Evaluation Standards 269
Summary 270

REFERENCE LIST 275

APPENDIX A 295

INDEX 299

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1 Common School and Higher Education Trends 49
2 Percentages of Adult Education Participants by Agency in 50 States and the District of Columbia 53
3 Percentages of Institutions by Summer Term/Session Purpose 87
4 Percentage by Major Responsibility and Change Since 1942 104
5 Percentage of Institutions by Special Group Served 132
6 Percentage of Institutions by Regular Summer Session Activity 133
7 Rank-Order of Reasons for Summer Attendance by Student Classification 148
8 Ratio of Summer to Fall Enrollments for Public and Private Colleges/Universities 1977-1984 152
9 Fifty Years of Summer Session Credit Enrollment at Washington State University 153
10 Eleven Years of Summer Session Credit Enrollment at University of Wisconsin-Madison 156
11 Percentages of Classified Faculty for Regular and Summer Term, 1960 164
12 Percentage Distribution of Summer Faculty by School/College and Type of Instructional Service 168
13 Percentages of Faculty by Rank, Gender, and Type of Four-Year Institution 169
14 Methods of Data Collection 297
15 Time-Frame for Completion of F.L.D.P. Program Evaluation 298

CHAPTER 1

OVERVIEW OF COLLEGIATE SUMMER SESSIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

Introduction

Before modern science produced information about the characteristics and nature of Hansen's disease, lepers were banned to a far away colony and forgotten for the duration of their lives. In the annals of higher education over many decades in the United States and Canada, a similar pall seems to have befallen collegiate summer terms. The paucity of research and literature generally available regarding the subject of college and university summer terms or summer sessions indicates the apparent banishment and relegation of this subject to some far off corner of the academic world. Students of higher education and practitioners have had very incomplete information available on summer-time college and university educational programs and activities. This circumstance is interesting, for the summer period represents between one-fourth and one-third of the year's collegiate operation and involves use of capital investments provided by taxpayer and other donors. While over the past seven decades, formally organized summer sessions have become an increasingly important part of total college and university operation, this portion of the operation has been neglected generally by researchers.

The little research which has been conducted constitutes a piecemeal approach to an understanding of the summer-time segment of collegiate operation. Much of the journal literature extant has been written by persons responsible for what happens during summer months and therefore reflects the missionary zeal and enthusiasm with which they have attacked their jobs. Except for a few instances, authors of books in the higher education field have neglected mention of the subject. Almost without exception, all have failed to bridge the connection between summer terms or sessions and academic calendar planning with all the philosophical, educational, social, and financial implications. As will be indicated later, the nature and characteristics of collegiate summer programs and activities have reflected demographic, economic, political, and social influences impacting on changing missions and thus academic calendar planning. Like the ocean waves, summer terms or sessions have waxed and waned with the trends of the times which affect collegiate institutions.

Much of the written material extant about summer sessions consists of reports issued by summer sessions associations and published journal articles. During the last decade, some literature has appeared on microfiche in the ERIC system. Many reports and articles are institution specific. Other reports are unpublished, hard to locate fugitive-type materials. The single comprehensive treatment of the topic until now remains the book prepared by Schoenfeld and Zillman.[1] It is the purpose of this book to provide an updated compilation of information about collegiate summer sessions in the context of their historical evolution. This approach will provide the scholar and practitioner alike a perspective for understanding better the information generated by current research and presented throughout the subsequent chapters.

Map of Contents and Design

The content of Chapter 1 is designed to provide a global perspective and orientation to the topic of collegiate summer sessions and a reference to the research literature available. Following this introduction, the reader is provided the historical basis necessary for an informed understanding and perspective about how summer sessions in colleges and universities got the way they are today (Chapters 2 and 3). Major threads of influence affecting the development of summer sessions have been sketched in a fashion here-to-fore unavailable to the higher education community. The historical development and influence of the collegiate calendar and its relationship to summer sessions as a major factor regarding the nature of summer terms appears in Chapter 8. Some collegiate administrators of institutions contemplating whether a calendar should be changed will find this chapter most informative.

Various features of collegiate summer terms, including organization and administration (Chapter 4), curriculums and instructional activities (Chapter 5), students (Chapter 6), and staff (Chapter 7) are described in both an historical and current context. Baseline information about practice is presented, and no attempt has been made to deal with how-to-do-it matters such as bulletin preparation, scheduling, or marketing.

The historical development, role, nature, and contribution of the major professional associations to which institutions having summer sessions as well as summer session administrators may hold membership are presented in Chapter 9. The treatment of this topic is the most complete extant. Major problems, issues, and trends regarding collegiate summer sessions are identified and discussed in Chapter 10. Attention is given in Chapter 11 to one of the most frequently neglected aspects of summer session operation, namely, evaluation. Helpful suggestions are advanced for evaluation.

The contents of this book should be helpful to administrators of several types (presidents and vice presidents, deans, provosts), summer session administrators, students of higher education, and the higher education community as a whole. Although collegiate summer terms have been an important part of higher education in the United States for some time, attitudes and viewpoints about their quality, nature, and importance have varied.

3

Perspectives Regarding Summer Sessions

University and college summer sessions have been viewed over the years with a wide range of perspectives. Those perspectives run from consideration of summer term educational activities as an integral part of total university and college year-around educational programs to academic orphans or appendages set apart and separate from other terms administratively and budgetarily as if they were somehow less worthy, not quite as respectable, of less quality, and likely to contaminate the on-going programs offered in other parts of the year. It is probably true that some summer sessions have been viewed from time-to-time by some central administrators as being money making ventures to help support on-going activities during the rest of the year. It is likely too that some practices were viewed as abuses, such as lowering summer admissions standards, and in earlier times, accepting into summer sessions teachers with backgrounds lacking in elementary and secondary levels of education and without liberal arts and sciences backgrounds. Viewed as abuses also may have been the over extensive use of adjunct and visiting faculty whose qualifications would not equal those of regular faculty and the cramming of course content usually taught over a regular term into a few weeks. It is likely excessive abuses by some institutions served to cast a shadow of doubt on respectability of summer sessions in general. Teaching has historically not been a high prestige occupation in the eyes of academicians, and since for decades the majority of summer students were practicing teachers, a certain stigma may have come to be associated with summer educational activities based on the predominant kinds of clientele served.

It is clear that university and college summer sessions were not just spontaneous developments designed to serve local demands. Rather they were spawned by economic demand in the general society coupled with ambition of school teachers for more thorough preparation and desire of the citizenry for better schools for their children. The real foundation for collegiate summer schools lies embedded in the broader more progressive spirit that characterized education during the last 35 years of the 1800s and the first two decades of the 1900s in keeping with social, political, and economic changes at large. A perusal of the next several chapters will reveal that the rise of any summer school in any field of knowledge was due to the primary and impelling motives for the education of teachers.

During the past one-half century, the spirit of thrift with emphasis on efficiency and economy has come to dominate any successful business enterprise. In recent times, the public has come to expect and call for more accountability, effectiveness, and efficiency in the use of their tax dollars expended for higher education as well as for other purposes. Will college and university administrators recognize and promote a movement in education which tends to eliminate waste and to speed up the educational process for students? What will be the future of an educational movement which was realized largely through the more rapid and thorough training of teachers when that function has been and is being increasingly taken over by teachers organizations and when teachers are compelled to have completed a collegiate level education for initial certification? What happens now when the propelling historical raison d'etre is gone?

Relationship of Summer Session to Extension, Continuing Education, Community Service, and Extended Education

There seems to be no universally adopted sharp delineation in higher education among the different types of out-reach educational activities designated as extension, continuing education, community services, and extended education. Offices responsible for educational activities other than those traditionally offered on campus for students to pursue a degree or other formally recognized award have been known by various labels or combinations of them. The difficulty in nomenclature may lie in the affixing of names to offices which confuse functions of programs and activities from a consumer's or participant's purpose or motive with the institutional function and delivery system. The titles of the offices and the kinds of programs and activities understood to fall within the different nomenclatures are in part dependent upon the type of college or university where they are found.

Extension

The offering by a university of credit courses at locations other than on campus which would count toward academic degrees antedated Federal government provision for the establishment of land grant colleges and financial support for defined certain types of out-reach programs and services provided by them to residents of a state. Besides those educational activities mandated and financially supported by federal monies in land grant universities, there is another commonly understood definition of college or university extension work. This definition includes the offering for degree credit in geographical locations in proximity to where prospective students live of graduate or undergraduate level courses regularly provided on campus. For participants, the opportunity afforded may represent continuing education, and their enhanced education may at the same time be a community service. But from an institutional provider standpoint such educational activities for which students register, the successful completion of which results in academic credit applicable toward a degree, are commonly known and defined as extension.

Continuing Education/Community Service

Continuing education from the college or university provider standpoint has typically been interpreted as including all formally organized and scheduled non-credit instructional activities under the aegis of the institution which require registration of participants. These activities exhibit a wide range of formats such as courses, workshops, clinics, seminars, conferences, and institutes. Excluded from this definition are all activities which can be credited toward a degree or other formal award granted by the institution. Also excluded are all activities which are primarily non-instructional in nature such as great artists series, mass media programs, art displays, lecture series, travel groups, etc. The latter types of activities to which the general public is invited to participate have commonly been classified as community services. This is the case also for a host of other kinds of primarily non-instructional activities designed to provide assistance or cultural enjoyment and enhancement of the general public or work sponsored by local, regional and state organizations and agencies.

Although few universities or state systems of higher education have bothered to inventory on any systematic basis the nature and number of continuing education activities offered or the numbers of persons served, it would behoove them to do so as a base for improvement, coordination, and evaluation. Community service type activities other than continuing education, as defined below, which may be performing a type of community service, are almost never, if ever, inventoried. A useful classification for inventorying and keeping an account of continuing education activities is one used for each six-month period by the State University of New York Central Staff Office of Institutional Research.[2] The categories by type of clientele served are as follows:

General Community
Industry and Business
Government/Public Service Employees
Educators
Special Interest Groups
Specific Professions and Vocations
Community Service Organizations
Prisoners/Institutional Inmates

That State office knows, for example that between July and December 1984, there were 6,590 continuing education activities provided for 267,795 registrants and that between January and June 1985, 7,054 activities served 278,294 registrants.[3] These activities and number of registrants are further displayed by category of service and by institution in the system.

Because the function of community services, sometimes referred to as public services, is considered to be different things by different persons, it would be helpful to develop usable definitions for categories of services. Perhaps no facet of college or university operation is less well-defined than community services. In a sense, all activity of a college or university, including the offering of all degree and certificate programs, can be broadly interpreted as community services whether the community is defined as the state, a region, or the local area in which the institution is situated. Scrutiny of non-instruction type activities commonly engaged in by colleges and universities are those designed to assist residents in the primary service area, however defined, who are seeking individually or through informal groups to improve their own lives. They also include those designed to assist existing organizations and agencies in establishing cooperative alliances to improve the physical, social, economic, and political environment to meet community-wide needs. Also included may be those activities designed to procure or coordinate the human and material resources required to implement an effective program. In short, a comprehensive community service or public service program concerns itself with individual, community, and program development. Such programs may be viewed as those action programs of the institution undertaken independently or in cooperation with other organizations, groups, or agencies which direct educational resources toward serving non-instructional individual, group, and community-wide needs.

Examples of community service activities for individual development could include community guidance activities designed to provide residents with opportunities for self-discovery and development through individual and group counseling processes, e.g., aptitude-interest testing, career information, family life, job placement, etc. Such activities could include the expansion of opportunities for residents to participate in a variety of recreational activities, e.g., summer youth programs, senior citizen activities, and other leisure time activities. Those activities might include also social out-reach programs designed to increase the earning power, educational level, and political influence of disadvantaged segments of the population.

Community services activities for community development might include community (state, regional, local) analysis, fostering inter-agency cooperation through establishing linkages with related programs of the institution and the community to supplement and coordinate rather than duplicate existing programs. Such activities might include public forums designed to stimulate interest and understanding of local, national, and world programs. Staff consultation might be included in which the consulting skills of the faculty are identified and made available to assist in community development and problem solving efforts, such as, laboratory testing, consulting with small business managers, and designing of field research studies.

The third type of community service activity designed for program development might include program management, public information, conference planning, professional staff development, and program evaluation.

Extended Education

Extended education has had multiple meanings and sometimes has been interpreted as being synonymous with continuing education. More typically, the term has come to denote education provided by out-reach activities, that is, education beyond the campus, delivered to remote or isolated areas by delivery systems other than face-to-face contact. Although the function served may be a continuation of education for the participating student and at the same time a community service, from the providers standpoint, extended education is provided by a non-traditional delivery system over long distances. Delivery systems might include print correspondence, broadcast television, use of communication satellites with fixed orbits about the earth to deliver both visual and audio signals, and interactive cable television systems. Included also may be use of video-cassettes and videotapes, videodiscs, a videotex interactive system, teletext, or a one-way broadcast television service.

The telephone, which is the most frequently used delivery technology, can carry images of audiographic devices such as the electronic blackboard used for years at the University of Illinois Engineering Continuing Education Office and the University of Wisconsin. At the University of Wisconsin, telephone networks have enabled a thousand faculty to serve over 33,000 engineers, lawyers, teachers, nurses, physicians, librarians, business people, and others. Each year over 3,000 students in Kansas at 64 locations have been served in both credit and non-credit classes through telephone networks in the six public four-year institutions. Used also for modes of educational delivery are audiocassette recordings of broadcasts, radio, and both computer assisted instruction (CAI) in which students communicate directly in an interactive mode with the computer and computer managed education (CMI) in which there is no direct student interaction with the computer. Developing technology enables a college or university to extend education beyond the campus to countless numbers of residents in locations where it is economically and/or geographically not feasible to establish traditionally organized classes and face-to-face interaction with a commuting faculty member or educational circuit rider.

Organizational Structures

Operationally, the responsibility for and administration of non-degree programs and activities have been separate from the on-going campus based instructional function of colleges and universities. These administrative structures range the gamut from having all extension work, including the federally subsidized extension activities, continuing education, community services, and other forms of extended studies organized under one office to other institutions where such activities are organized and administered by divisions, colleges, schools, and even departments of the institution. In between, a variety of arrangements exist. It is not uncommon to find extension services in agriculture and related youth and adult education, engineering extension, and labor and industrial or business related extension activities administered by the respective colleges. Then most other types of extension activities are administered by an office created for the purpose such as Continuing Education and Public Service, University Extension, School of Extended Learning, Continuing Learning, Continuing Learning and Special Programs, Extension and Continuing Education, Graduate Studies and Extended Learning, Continuing Education and Summer Sessions, Summer Session and Continuing Education, Adult, Continuing, and Extended Studies, and Innovative Studies and Extension Services. The organizational structure depends upon individual institutional missions, goals and objectives, legal or regulatory mandates, available resources, public expectations, and the creativity, imagination, and interests of the leadership. In practice, no distinct cleavage is usually made among the types of non-degree, non-credit courses, programs, or types of activities offered both on and off campus, except that they result in no academic credit. This distinction doesn't always hold up, for in some instances the distinction is made that degree credit courses offered in locations other than on campus (extension) fall under the aegis of and are coordinated by the institutional office responsible for continuing education, community services, or extended education, while some types of non-academic credit activities may be provided on campus under the aegis of instructional units. In general, the most prevalent practice is to make distinctions on the basis of whether activities are credit generating and by location of the activity (on or off campus).

Connections with Summer Sessions

College and university summer sessions are typically concerned with campus-based educational activities during the summer term. These activities are predominately academic credit generating degree-oriented courses and programs. However, programmatically, the planning for summer period activities may also include continuing education and community services types of activities, most of which are typically held on campus or in close proximity. Such activities range from artists and lecture series or other cultural and recreational events to Elderhostel for senior citizens, registered nurse or other professional field refresher programs, post-doctoral upgrading seminars or institutes, upgrading activities for water, utility, wastewater, and sanitation personnel, and short-term workshops or specifically focused institutes for teachers. As higher education institutions come to more realistically recognize both the demand and opportunity to serve the needs of citizens in the knowledge and information age of modern times, there may be an opportunity during summer periods for the continuation of some outreach activities fostered during other terms.

One of the important relationships of Summer Sessions and Continuing Education is an organizational one. Young and McDougall found that in 16% of the public research, doctoral granting and comprehensive colleges and universities holding membership in either the North American Association of Summer Sessions (NAASS) or the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators (WASSA), the Summer Session chief administrator reported to an official with the title of Dean/Director of Continuing Education or Dean/Director of Continuing Education and Summer Session.[4] Between the 1978 and 1981 school years, change in organizational structure affecting the placement of responsibility for Summer Sessions had occurred in a relatively small percentage of institutions studied (9%). Most of the changes involved the placement of responsibility for Summer Sessions under the aegis of a Continuing Education unit. Another change was to lodge placement of responsibility for Summer Session with a higher echelon administrative office than previously, a slight trend toward greater centralization of responsibility. Between 1982 and 1984, change in administrative structure affecting the organizational placement of administration and responsibility for summer sessions in the United States was found by Young and McDougall to have occurred in 20% of the private and public universities of the types mentioned above.[5] In 10% of the instances, summer session administration and responsibility had been combined with Continuing Education, Extended Learning, and/or other Extension/Public Service unit. In 7% of the cases, summer session had been subsumed under another larger administrative unit (e.g., academic affairs, registrar, etc.), and 3% had been organized as part of the Graduate School. The greatest incidence of change took place in the North Central and Western-Northwestern regions of the United States. The degree of centralization for programming had increased in 11% of the institutions.

Thus, there has been a slight but definite trend for the placement of responsibility for summer session in an administrative unit responsible for continuing education and/or extension type programs. This trend may reflect both economic and philosophical conditions. In an era of financial retrenchment and tight dollar availability, the combining of responsibility for summer session under the administrative umbrella of outreach educational programs may reflect an effort to cut costs. From a philosophical point of view, the trend may reflect the concept that summer period activities are, in fact, considered to be a type of campus based outreach program, somehow undeserving a mainstream academic alignment with the on-going academic activities during the rest of the year. If the latter position is reflected, it is an unfortunate one which is incongruous with trends during the 1980s for higher percentages of summer session enrollments to consist of regular term degree program students.

On many campuses, the total summer term offerings consist of educational activities organized and administered under the jurisdiction of both the Summer Session Office and the Continuing Education/Extension Office. The determination of appropriateness is usually based on whether academic credit is granted and, in addition, whether an activity is deemed to be self-supporting or one for which state fund expenditures can be justified in public institutions. Given these circumstances, there is need for close liaison, coordination, and cooperation for planning purposes between the respective administrative officials.

Relationship to Institutional Goals

Regardless of how organizational theorists view a college or university as a social organization (political, bureaucratic, collegial, etc.), most recognize that an overall structure exists and that this structure consists of many organized, subordinate sub-units. Likewise, the university itself is a subordinate component of a specific larger system maintained by the state, religious organization, private interest group, and/or complex of collegiate education organizations nationally. The effect of organizational subordination is to limit the purposes or ways in which subordinate units may operate with respect to other units and the character, number, or status of persons who may belong to and be served by them. These limitations which determine the scope of performance are typically communicated by such documents as charters, state constitutions, and legislative enactments, both special and general, and regulatory bodies.

Today, all formal complex educational organizations known as colleges and universities are constituted of numbers of small organizations or units by necessities for intercommunication relevant to the activities required to foster performance within the limitations prescribed by the larger and superior system of which the institution is a part. Many of the sub-units of organization perform specialized functions aligned to the overall purpose and mission for which the institution exists. Size and the need for effective communication as much as any other factors determine the number and type of subsidiary unit organizations. In an effective and efficient operating organization, each of the sub-units will have their own mission, functions, goals and objectives. It is essential that there be a great deal of congruence between those sub-unit guides for action and the university or college guides for performance.

In collegiate institutions where summer term activities, by virtue of financial support and budget, programmatic planning, or administration are different than those pertinent to other terms in the year, a summer sessions sub-unit of organization exists. It is important that the guides for action by the summer session unit of organization be identified, articulated, and publicized, and these guides (mission, functions, goals, and objectives) should be aligned and congruent with the institutional performance guides of the same kind. Failure to recognize the interrelation between needs, goals, and the values of the two along with the limitations and constraints thus placed on the summer session unit can perpetuate or lead to perceived and real marginality, separation, and sense of impotence. It is important that the Summer Session Office or sub-unit have written statements of these guides for action and that they have taken into consideration the important values and expectations of its host.

While such statements of guides for action lend greater clarity to the major directions and the most appropriate courses of action, those involved in developing or re-examining such statements find equal value in the process. It is through this process involving central administration officials and representatives of the university community serving on an Advisory Board or faculty governing body that all become knowledgeable about the nature, place, and role of summer session. In some instances, members of the governing board of control may be involved in adopting or approving the statements, and in other instances, they might merely receive them for informational purposes. It is through this process that values are articulated, possible conflicting assumptions are identified, and a sense of commitment and involvement occur.

Because conditions change and new expectations arise, and within the latitude afforded by the authorized institutional scope of performance, the performance guides of a college or university must be regarded as constantly evolving. Such is the case with summer session action guides. This evolutionary process is a phenomenon which demands continuous periodic review and updating and consequent involvement and re-commitment by those who must carry out the mission, functions, goals, and objectives. These kinds of statements by college and university summer session units will vary among institutions, reflecting the uniqueness of each unit in terms of values, resources, opportunities, strengths, weaknesses, leadership, and environments.

In a study of public and private research, doctoral granting, and comprehensive collegiate institutions, it was found that only about one-fifth (21%) of the institutions had a written statement of the mission and goals for the summer session. In only 9% of the institutions had the written statement of summer session mission and goals been approved by the institutional community, including the central administration. In 16% of the institutions, the role and mission statement for the summer session had been reviewed internally within the previous three-year period. Most colleges and universities had an institutional role and mission statement which had been adopted/approved by the governing board.

Although a statistically significant (.01) larger percentage of summer session association members than non-members had statements of action guidelines, the fact that they don't exist in about eight of every ten collegiate institutions seems a sad organizational commentary.[6] During the last six decades, much effort has been expended by summer session administrators to insure that the quality of summer session programs are equivalent in all respects to programs offered during other parts of the year. But, it appears that the efforts to identify, articulate, and publicize how the summer session fits into the organization and contributes to the achievement of institutional mission, goals, and objectives has been neglected. Until summer session administrators take the initiative to do this, and thus create a better and broader understanding of what summer sessions are all about, the perceptions of second-class citizenship and marginality are likely to persist.

Objectives of Summer Sessions

The purposes and objectives of summer school are often not articulated in a clear and concise manner. Such statements are many and diverse, and they have changed over the years to reflect trends in clientele served. To reveal the change in emphasis an examination has been made of objectives enunciated in the years 1930, 1960, and 1985.

Objectives in 1930

An inquiry was made of the 47 land-grant colleges and universities extant in 1930 located within the continental United States, and 39 replied.[7] Although some objectives reflected the unique mission of those institutions, it is likely that others were typical of other types of colleges and universities having summer sessions during that time. Objectives are listed in descending order of mention. The frequency of mention is shown in parenthesis.

1. To train teachers in-service; meet the needs of teachers who wish to increase their professional skill, to revise and extend their knowledge of a chosen field, or to qualify in new subjects. Prepare teachers to meet the special demand for instruction in various fields and those desiring preparation to teach in vocational schools and classes. Give teachers opportunity to raise the grade of certificates previously obtained and to earn degrees (33).

2. To serve regular undergraduate and graduate students with regular courses leading to a degree; enable undergraduate students to take courses they are unable to include in their regular programs (22).

3. To prepare school administrators and/or supervisors; to train administrators for consolidated schools (11).

4. To enable students to shorten their courses of study sometimes to three instead of four years (13).

5. To enable undergraduate students to make up deficiencies (9).

6. To train teachers in vocational agriculture and home economics, and in trades and industries and for technical schools (6).

7. To enable high-school graduates to meet special subject matter requirements to enter some colleges and professional schools, those desiring to obtain surplus credit at entrance, and those about to enter the university wishing to broaden their preparation for university work (4).

8. To serve any serious student who finds courses suited to his preparation and needs (3).

9. To serve housewives, graduate nurses, social workers, Americanization workers, students of public health, and all adults who are qualified to pursue with profit any course given, whether or not they are engaged in teaching or study (2).

10. To keep the university plant in operation throughout the year so that students who desire to do so may continue their work uninterrupted until their courses are completed (2).

It can be seen that the predominant emphasis was on the servicing of teachers and school administrators and regularly enrolled students pursuing degrees. Various other objectives were mentioned once. While they might be encompassed within one or more of the foregoing objectives, they are presented here to reveal the scope of summer session programs as viewed appropriate when the 1930s began. Other objectives statements were:

1. To serve the needs of persons needing training for Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. and social-welfare work, including playground directors.

2. To prepare agricultural and home economics agents.

3. To provide adult education.

4. To serve persons who seek opportunity for intellectual pleasure.

5. To promote the interests of general culture in combination with recreation and social pursuits.

6. To serve those persons seeking general culture and who wish to spend the summer to satisfy a special interest in some field of study.

7. To serve graduate students for whom the advantage of smaller classes and more direct and intimate personal contact with professors is possible during summer session.

8. To open the possibilities for study in institutes and special departments either nonexistent or else not so extensively developed during the winter term.

9. To provide short courses to groups of people who can come for only a week or 10 days.

10. To supply subjects for students who have been ill and also for students transferring from other colleges.

11. To acquaint high-school graduates with the methods of instruction and the policies and practices in collegiate work before registering in the regular session during the academic year.

12. To offer courses for high-school and elementary school pupils in the demonstration school.

13. To duplicate, so far as appropriations permit, regular semester courses offered by the university and to offer additional courses in education on account of large registrations.

14. To carry on the regular work of the university through the summer session.

Changes in Objectives By the 1960s

By the 1960s, the predominant and almost single emphasis on meeting the needs of school teachers and administrators had changed, and no single purpose had overwhelming primacy.[8] Based on 96.2% responses of 2,046 collegiate institutions contacted, summer session purposes indicated as being of much or average importance are shown below in descending order:

1. Acceleration. To provide for students of the other terms to accelerate their programs and obtain their degrees or certificates earlier than would be otherwise possible (70%).
2. Expansion. To provide opportunity to the largest possible number of students by making summer session on integral part of an all-year academic program (53%).
3. Rehabilitation. To provide for students of other terms the opportunity to repair subject matter deficiencies (57%).
4. Enrichment. To provide for students opportunity to become more proficient in their special fields (53%) by making additional elective courses available.
5. Exploration. To provide for students and faculty the opportunity to engage in cooperative approaches to problems through workshops, seminars, institutes, etc. (31%).
6. Demonstration. To provide for the institution the opportunity to demonstrate new program ideas (23%).

Respondents indicated other purposes they considered of much or average importance. Of all respondents, 14% indicated that meeting needs of teachers for enrichment, degrees, and certification or renewal was of much or average importance as a summer session objective. Less than one percent mentioned as purposes the offering of opportunities for further training to non-teaching professions, such as law, engineering, nursing, and the clergy. Accommodating students home on vacation from other colleges, offering a range of graduate work not possible in other terms, and permitting students to lighten other term loads by taking summer work were also included. Only 0.2% mentioned the provision of faculty with additional income was important, and only 0.1% had use of facilities as a purpose. When these purposes are ranked in order according to the number of institutions indicating they were of much importance, the rank order of acceleration and expansion were reversed (28.9% compared to 33.6%, respectively) as were enrichment and rehabilitation (20.1% compared to 17.2%, respectively).

Several observations about the 1960 findings seem warranted. First, the most important purposes of expansion, acceleration, enrichment, and rehabilitation, and possibly exploration to some extent, are associated with work in other terms. These purposes seem to portend an inclination to integrate summer term work into a common pattern with that of other terms. The relatively less emphasis on exploration and demonstration as summer session purposes might be evidence of possible abandonment of curricular experimentation opportunity. The latter was a purpose historically used to justify as well as to attack the existence of summer sessions. The latter conditions might further signify evidence of the growing identity of summer session with the other terms.

Objectives in the 1980s

Further information about summer session objectives was provided in 1980 by member universities of the Association of University Summer Sessions.[9] Each institutional representative was asked to rank order the objectives of summer sessions as they existed and to rank order them as they would like to see them exist. Perfect rank order congruence between existing and desired objectives were found for the following three objectives in order of listing:

1. To provide courses for the university's degree students,
2. To provide courses for other identifiable groups of students, and
3. To use the University Plant more fully by attracting students, alumni, etc.

Other objectives cited are shown by existing and desired importance:

Objective	Existing Importance	Desired Importance
4. To provide summer employment for faculty.	4	6
5. To provide income for the university.	5	7
6. To attract admissions to the university.	6	5
7. To provide experimental offerings in at least 10% of its programs.	7	4

There was an inverse relationship between the importance of objectives extant and the importance which respondents would like to have accorded them after the top three displayed above. The effect was that the objective of experimentation should be much more important and the objectives to produce money for the institution and to provide employment for faculty should be less important objectives.

The most extensive recent information on objectives of summer sessions has been reported from a national study by Young and McDougall of public and private United States universities classified by Carnegie type as research, doctoral granting, and comprehensive and all comparable Canadian universities.[10] They found that, though the summer session operation is included in the bylaws of about one-third of the institutions, statements of specific purposes of summer sessions are often neglected and are non-existent in about 80% of the institutions. By rank order and percentage of universities, purposes are listed below for USA and Canadian universities:

	USA		Canadian	
Purposes for Summer Session	Rank	%	Rank	%
1. Provide courses for regular degree students.	1	98	2	100
2. Permit regular academic year students to make up deficiencies.	2	84	2	100
3. Provide courses for identifiable groups other than regular degree students.	3	82	2	100
4. More fully utilize plant facilities.	4	63	4	80
5. Provide summer employment for faculty.	5	57	8	20
6. Provide income to the institution's general budget.	6	54	8	20
7. Attract new admissions for the regular academic term.	7	53	8	20
8. Offer special programs not regularly offered for selected groups such as alumni, senior citizens, etc.	8	40	6	50
9. Encourage and provide a setting for experimental offerings.	9	39	5	70

In 1985, the most frequently mentioned summer session purposes were to provide courses for regular (or other) term students, including opportunity for regular degree program students to make up deficiencies, and to provide courses for other identifiable groups. Greater utilization of plant facilities throughout the year had become a relatively top level purpose of summer sessions in both countries. In each country institutions faced budget reductions and scrutiny for accountability during the late 1970s and the 1980s. Providing income for faculty, income for the institutions' general budget, and attracting new admissions for the regular (other) terms were purposes next in order for USA institutions. The offering of special programs not regularly offered for selected groups, such as alumni, senior citizens, returning women, ethnic minorities, and the like and provision of a setting for experimental offerings were last in order of adoption as purposes by universities. However, the latter two purposes were accepted by Canadian universities as being of higher order than providing employment for faculty, generating institutional income, or attracting new admissions. A variety of other purposes were identified by 5% of the USA institutions and none of those in Canada.

These data would indicate that since 1960, there was in the United States further abandonment of the purpose for summer term to be a time when new and innovative activities are tried out. The emphasis has definitely come to focus on service to students, both undergraduate and graduate, who are regularly enrolled during other terms.

The manner by which such goals and purposes or objectives are prioritized varies greatly by institution according to the philosophy of the institution, the expectations of the administration and governing bodies regarding the role of summer session, available resources, budgetary support, and the values and point of view held by the chief summer administrator.

During the 1980s, many institutions have been adopting partial or full self-support methods of funding summer programs. Thus, financial considerations become paramount sometimes at the risk of diminishing high cost but important dimensions of the summer program, i.e., high cost graduate courses. Some other institutions are still committed to experimentation and innovation, a purpose often cited as an important function of summer school by planners and administrators within the university community. A general trend in recent years has been a move towards more conservative and predictable objectives de-emphasizing risk-type summer planning. This trend is associated with shrinking budgetary support and demands for greater accountability.

Sketch of Research on Summer Sessions

A purpose of this section is to provide the interested reader a ready reference to the research about collegiate summer sessions. Information contained here demonstrates the nature and paucity of research about the subject. Besides the bibliography provided in this book, the most complete elsewhere contains bibliographic citations divided into the periods before 1945 and since then up to 1978.[11] With some overlap in entries, a supplementary bibliography is available from the North American Association of Summer Sessions.[12]

Some dissertations have been completed on the subject of summer sessions. In the early 1920s when there was heightened public demand for better qualified teachers, Judd examined summer sessions in the context of their historical evolution in 150 representative state normal schools and 50 universities as agencies for the education of teachers, and Avent studied summer sessions in state teacher's colleges as a factor in the professional development of teachers.[13] Dickerman studied the development of summer sessions in higher educational institutions in the United States to 1945, and May compiled a history of the Association of University Summer Sessions with special reference to the administration of summer sessions.[14] Many summer session administrators today would likely find both historical studies of considerable interest. Fallon studied the influence of the summer school movement on the state of Michigan, 1874-1931 with special reference to the University of Michigan, and Ritchie developed a history of the University of Nebraska Summer Sessions from 1891 to 1915.[15] Courter analyzed selected aspects of the Syracuse University summer sessions, and Belle examined the rationale for summer sessions in the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.[16]

Cundiff examined the administrative, educational, fiscal, and personnel policies of 125 institutions classified as private universities, private liberal arts colleges, state universities, and state colleges.[17] On the basis of ratios between regular and summer enrollments, he selected 5 high (successful) and 5 low (unsuccessful) institutions in each of the four categories and examined differences in administrative policies related to admissions, budget, publicity, special programs and courses, and use of visiting faculty. Miller studied factors associated with summer sessions in a one-third random sample of United States liberal arts colleges.[18] Heidenreich studied the powers and functions of summer session directors in selected institutions of higher education in the United States.[19]

Studies specific to particular universities on the impact of a summer program for college competency and on students not meeting admissions requirements who undertook a summer program to prepare them for admission were conducted by McCleay and Slate, respectively.[20] In the same vein, McCandless evaluated a guidance-structured summer session for entering university freshmen; Shroder examined characteristics of students in a pre-college summer session program at George Washington University; and Selsky evaluated an upward-bound university program at the University of South Alabama.[21]

Various other studies varied in scope and sophistication. One of the first of national scope provided normative type information about summer sessions among institutions in the United States. Status data for 1960 were obtained on characteristics such as enrollments, curricula, purposes, finance (budgets, fees, and scholarships), administration, students and programs (credits earned and degree requirements completed). A brief historical sketch was developed as a backdrop to the study.[22] Seagren and Randall contributed to the historical perspective by developing a history covering a thirty-year span of annual programs held by the North Central Conference on Summer Schools.[23] A review of the programs reveals matters of concern discussed at the annual conferences, some of which reflect the changing ecological environment in which higher education has operated.

Besides the Joint Statistical Reports published by the North American Association of Summer Sessions (NAASS) and the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators (WASSA), previous association studies have been concerned with specific programs and program areas, academic calendars, academic performance, enrollment, promotion/marketing, students, planning, faculty renumeration, foreign study, history, and administration. Among the more recent pertinent studies in administration, Thompson studied the nature of the administrative organization of summer schools,[24] and Deal identified the major problems of summer session administrators.[25] Jointly administered summer sessions and continuing education were studied in ten universities by Coyne.[26] Hooten investigated career patterns and competency needs of summer session administrators, and Nelson received information from 186 four-year colleges and 189 universities on job titles and responsibilities of summer session administrators, administrative reporting lines, and finances.[27] As part of his effort to recommend a plan of action for Saint Joseph's College in Philadelphia, George conducted a summer session survey, and McGill examined summer session programs in state supported institutions with memberships in the North American Association of Summer Sessions.[28] Faculty summer salaries and length of summer sessions were studied in 1986 by Applbaum.[29] He received information from 54% of a randomly selected group of 200 public and private collegiate institutions, excluding Texas colleges and universities, to determine practice against which to compare conditions among all Texas institutions.

Change in patterns of summer session organizational structure was the primary focus of a 1982 study by Young and McDougall.[30] From a 33% random sample of all public institutions in the United States classified by Carnegie type as research, comprehensive, or doctoral granting holding membership in either the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators or the North American Association of Summer Sessions an 84.6% response was received. All similar type Canadian universities participated. They sought to determine what the organizational patterns were, what changes had occurred between 1978-79 and 1980-81, and what relationships existed between the patterns and institutional enrollment size, Carnegie type, and career patterns of summer session administrators. Changes over the three-year period were investigated also in sources and amounts of financial support, internal organization for summer school activities, number of FTE hours generated, numbers of credit generating educational activities offered, and effects of changes on staff morale. As a consequence of this study, another was conducted in 1985 with a 33% random sample of all private and public institutions of the same Carnegie types in the United States and all Canadian universities, regardless of whether membership was held in one of the summer session associations. This study examined changes between 1982 and 1984 in the nature and characteristics of summer sessions. The study also sought to determine how changes might be related to institutional enrollment size, Carnegie type, geographical location, summer session organizational and administrative structure, control (public or private), and whether membership was held in one of the summer session associations. In addition, summer programs and activities considered to be creative (innovative, unique, exemplary, or experimental) were identified. All Canadian universities responded to the study, and of a 93.8% total response from universities in the United States, a usable response of 86.4% was realized.[31] Of the latter group of respondents, fifty-five respondents indicated they had one or more creative type programs or activities. From this group, a small panel selected fourteen of the most creative for further exploration through campus site visits and interviews with appropriate concerned staff and administrators. This 1986 effort sought to determine factors perceived to be associated with the existence of the creative programs.[32] Although some Canadian universities had creative programs, they were excluded for logistical reasons.

Another 1986 study by Warren of administrative roles, career development, and attitudes in research universities with over 5,000 enrollment sought data from Directors of Summer Sessions, Graduate Deans, and Directors of Admissions.[33] A major question was whether backgrounds of newer directors of summer sessions differed from those of older directors.

A review of research completed reveals that responses to various studies of summer sessions have generally been on the low side (65 percent or less). Further observation reveals that many requests for information sought derived data which a respondent would have to calculate (percentages, averages, sums, etc.), statistical information from the files and records, or lengthy written responses. Percentages of response obtained from association member institutions invited to submit information for inclusion in the Summer Sessions Associations' Joint Statistical Report for the years 1976-1988, except for four years, ranged below 40 percent. In 1977, 1984, and 1985 the return was about 45 percent, but in 1986, a telephone contact garnered a 68.3 percent return. Studies by Young and McDougall and Warren were funded in part by the summer session associations, and the 1985 Young-McDougall study was endorsed by the National University Continuing Education Association. This organizational support and the persistent dogged follow-up efforts by investigators paid dividends in high levels of response.

This review of research demonstrates the general lack of attention by scholars and theorists to studies other than historical and normative types about the summer-time operations of collegiate institutions. The potential and opportunity seems great for in-depth analyses, particularly by behavioral scientists, concerning problems revealed by the present base of historical and normative evidence.

Chapter 1 -- Endnotes

1. Clarence A. Schoenfeld and Ronald N. Zillman, The American University in Summer (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967).

2. State University of New York, Office of Institutional Research, Non-Credit Instructional Activities, January 1, 1985 Through June 30, 1985, with Trend Information for 1983, 1984, and 1985, Report Number 20-85A, ERIC, ED 265 768, 19.

3. Ibid., 7.

4. Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall, Relationships of Selected Factors to Summer Session Organizational Structure (Calgary: University of Calgary Faculty of Continuing Education), 1982, ERIC, ED 235 734.

5. Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall, Recent Changes in Summer Sessions of U.S. an Canadian Colleges and Universities (St. Louis: North American Association of Summer Sessions, 1985).

6. Ibid., 16.

7. U.S. Office of Education, Survey of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, Bulletin No. 9, Volume II (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1930), 401-405.

8. U.S. Office of Education, Summer Sessions in Colleges and Universities of the United States, 1960, by Donald F. Warner, Bernice R. Retzlaff, and Harold A. Haswell, Circular No. 700 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963), 19-22.

9. Alan T. Seagren, Keith J. Soloman, and Lynda J. McNulty, "Strategies for the Internal Development of Summer Sessions," Paper presented at the North American Summer Sessions Conference of Charlotte, North Carolina, November 1980, 8.

10. Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall, Recent Changes in Summer Sessions of U.S. and Canadian Colleges and Universities, 18.

11. Clarence A. Schoenfeld et al., A Bibliography of Summer Sessions Literature in Higher Education (Madison: University of Wisconsin -- Madison Summer Sessions Office, April 1978).

12. North American Association of Summer Sessions," Summer Sessions Bibliography" (mimeographed and undated).

13. Cornelius D. Judd, The Summer School as an Agency for the Training of Teachers in the United States. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, Contributions to Education No. 3, 1921; Joseph H. Avent, "The Summer Sessions in State Teacher's Colleges as a Factor in the Professional Education of Teachers" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1925).

14. Watson B. Dickerman, "The Historical Development of the Summer Session in Higher Institutions in the United States" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1945); Russell A. May, "A History of the Association of University Summer Sessions: Fifty Years of Progress" (Ed.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1970).

15. Jerome A. Fallon, "The Influence of the Summer School on the State of Michigan, 1874-1931 with Special Reference to the University of Michigan" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1959); Linda C. Ritchie, "History of the University of Nebraska Summer Sessions: 1891-1915" (Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1980).

16. John F. Courter, "An Analysis of Selected Aspects of the Syracuse University Summer Sessions" (Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1963); Robert L. Belle, "The Summer Sessions Rationale in the School of Education, The University of Wisconsin-Madison" (Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1972).

17. Edward W. Cundiff, "The University Summer Session" (Ed.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1952).

18. John E. Miller, "Factors Associated with Summer Sessions in Selected United States Liberal Arts Colleges" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington State University, 1989).

19. Charles A. Heidenreich, "A Study of the Functions and Powers of Summer Session Directors in Selected Institutions of Higher Education in the United States" (Ed.D. dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1965).

20. William B. Macleay III, "An Analysis of the Impact of the Colorado State College Summer Program for Competency, 1963-1965 (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1974); Joe H. Slate, "A Study of Students Not Meeting Admissions Requirements and a Summer Program to Preface Them for Admission (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Alabama, 1970).

21. Charles E. McCandless, "An Evaluation of a Guidance-Structured Summer Session for Entering University Freshmen" (Ed.D. Dissertation, North Texas State University, 1966); Edward F. Shrader, "A Descriptive Study of Students in the Pre-College Summer Session Program" (Ed.D. Dissertation, The University of Maryland, 1965); Joel M. Selsky, "An Evaluative Study of the University of South Alabama's First Upward Bound Summer Program" (Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Houston, 1974).

22. U.S. Office of Education, Summer Sessions in Colleges and Universities of the United States 1960 (Circular No. 700).

23. Alan T. Seagren and Ruth E. Randall, Thirty Years of Sharing, Summer Sessions Commitment to Students, Innovations and Quality. North Central Conference on Summer Schools, 1949-1978 (Rockford, Illinois: North Central Conference on Summer Schools, 1979), ERIC, ED 181 813.

24. Ronald B. Thompson, "A Survey of the Nature of the Administrative Organization of Summer Schools," Columbus: Ohio State University, 1973 (mimeographed).

25. William M. Deal, Jr., "Major Problems of Summer Session Administration" (A study conducted for the Research Committee of NAASS, June 1977).

26. Leslie J. Coyne, "An Analysis of Jointly Administered Summer Sessions and Continuing Education in Institutions of Higher Education (Ed.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1978).

27. David E. Hooten, Career Patterns and Competency Needs of Summer Session Administrators, North American Association of Summer Sessions, October 1974; Michael U. Nelson, "A Survey of Summer Session Administration: A Sample of 189 Universities," October 1972; and, "A Survey of Summer Session Administration: A Sample of 186 Four-Year Colleges," October 1972 (Research Reports for the Association of University Summer Sessions).

28. Richard J. George, "Summer Sessions Survey," Department of Business Administration, St. Joseph's College, April 1975; E. C. McGill, "A Study of Summer Session Programs in State Supported Colleges and Universities Which Are Members of the North American Association of Summer Schools," Office of Summer Sessions, Southern Oregon State College, November 1979.

29. Ronald L. Applbaum, "Summer Session Report: Summary and Analysis." Edinburg, Texas: Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs, Pan American University (mimeographed and undated).

30. Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall, Relationships of Selected Factors to Summer Session Organizational Structure (Calgary: University of Calgary Faculty of Continuing Education, 1982), ERIC, ED 235 734.

31. Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall, Recent Changes in Summer Sessions of U.S. and Canadian Colleges and Universities (St. Louis: North American Association of Summer Sessions, 1985).

32. Raymond J. Young, "Factors Associated with Creativity: Educational Programming for Summer Terms," Continuing Higher Education Review 53 (Winter 1989): 27-34.

33. Helen Warren, "Administrative Roles: Challenge and Change Survey Results," A study conducted for the North American Association of Summer Sessions (University Park, Pennsylvania: Office of Summer Session, undated).

CHAPTER 2

CONTEXTUAL ENVIRONMENT FOR COLLEGIATE SUMMER STUDY BEFORE 1900

Introduction

Formerly organized collegiate summer-time programs and activities, variously referred to as summer sessions, terms, or schools, did not just happen at a given point in time. Although they began during the 1890s and flourished throughout the 1900s, the movement for their development was a consequence of many environmental factors. Not the least of these factors were various formal and non-formal educational antecedents. The evolution of the public common school system, and the development of collegiate and teacher education were significantly associated formal antecedents. Among the non-formal and powerful influences were the development of the American Lyceum, the Chautauqua, the creation of organizations for educational purposes, and the quest for educational reform and improvement of quality. A major purpose of Chapter 2 is to provide some background factors associated with collegiate summer-time programs and activities prior to the year 1900. It is hoped this information will help the reader to have a broader and more in-depth understanding of the relationships between these factors and the on-going work and development of collegiate summer terms/sessions.

Formal Educational Antecedents[1]

The organizational character of American education in the 1990s is largely a product of forces set in motion and events that occurred during the 1800s which established the foundation. While no pretense is made toward detailing all those influences and events here, the picture is painted verbally using broad strokes which reveal some of the most pertinent features of educational development prior to the turn of this century.

Common School Developments

In the early years of the nineteenth century, the seeds of nationalism, which were germinated during the latter part of the previous century, came to fruition in the form of increased emphasis upon enlightened patriotism. This purpose added to those stemming from religious reform movements, the development of vernacular literatures, and demands of the expanding commercial and industrial economy fostered an emphasis on the need for elementary education. By the early 1800s, American schools originally founded upon European models had been modified consonant with the prevailing and different set of social conditions. The idea of universal elementary school education had been established, but it wasn't until after mid-century that provisions were widely adopted for its implementation.

By the second quarter of the 1800s, the American populace entered an era of awakening in which desire for social improvements along many lines, including education, accompanied the developing industrial revolution in which the factory system and manufacturing enterprises for economic self-sufficiency were manifestations. Politically, the influence of Jacksonian political philosophy implanted a firm belief in localized administration of all civil affairs, including education. The extension of suffrage after 1820 further emphasized the political purpose of education. With the establishment in this era of state boards of education in a number of states to supervise schools, beginning in 1837 in Massachusetts, a long struggle began for the improvement of schools. Free common elementary school systems began to develop, and by 1870, the civil responsibility for this level of education had been accepted in most states. However, except in larger developing cities, most elementary schools were ungraded, one-room, one-teacher, and poorly equipped schools with short terms. With the increase in school population necessitating more than one school in a community and the advent of graded textbooks, such as the McGuffey series, a system of grades developed. Following Horace Mann's demand for standardization of schools in Massachusetts, leaders in other states, such as John Pierce of Michigan and Henry Bennard of Connecticut, advocated such reforms in their respective areas.

In the 1600s, the Latin Grammar School provided secondary education for boys until advent of the Academy around the mid-1700s, which enrolled girls as well as boys. The Academy reached its numerical peak around 1850 after which it was rapidly replaced by growth of the free public high school that had its beginnings in 1821 at Boston. An important factor in the demise of the Academy was the Michigan Supreme Court decision rendered by Judge Cooley in 1874, known as the Kalamazoo Decision. This decision, followed by similar decisions in some other states, legalized the use of public tax revenues for the provision and financial support of public high schools.

Rapid growth of the public high school prior to turn of this century may be sketched briefly to demonstrate the enormous growing quest of American people for education beyond the elementary school level. By 1860, there were 321 public high schools of which over one-half were located in Massachusetts, New York, and Ohio. In 1890, the number had increased to 2,526, and by 1900 6,005 public high schools were in operation. Between 1890 and 1900, the numbers of students attending increased from 202,963 to 519,251. During this decade, the 137.7 percent increase in numbers of schools and the 155.8 percent increase in numbers of students reflects the many societal pressures for extended education for the young and attests the value placed on education through the secondary school level.[2]

Development of Collegiate Education

A year following the establishment of the College des Jesuites in Quebec, Harvard College became the second higher education institution founded north of Mexico.[3] Except for the non-denominational Academy and College in Philadelphia, the other eight small colonial colleges established by 1769 had a religious dominant purpose. By 1800, fifteen more institutions had been established, and none of the two dozen institutions admitted women.

Oberlin College in Lorain County, Ohio, began in 1833 as the first coeducational college. All states west of the Mississippi River, except Missouri, followed the example set by the state university of Iowa and established their universities as coeducational. Most state institutions east of the Mississippi followed the lead of Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois in opening doors to women. Since women were not accepted to any collegiate institutions in the United States, the action of Emma Willard in 1821 of founding a female seminary for girls at Troy, New York was repeated in numerous locations. Such action was the precursor of the Vassars, Smiths, and Wellesleys later established. By 1860, 61 colleges admitted women. The University of Pennsylvania, created in 1740, was the first state supported public university in the United States. By 1860 there were sixteen additional state universities of which Ohio University and Miami University of Ohio, having been stimulated by grants of land, were the first in the new western frontier. The total number of higher education institutions by this time was 246. Prior to 1870, the provision of higher education had been largely a private effort, and while several state universities were in existence, they were not particularly different from the denominational colleges around them. During the six decades after 1820, there was a great proliferation of denominational colleges as the frontier pushed westward. The protection of private institutions from state interference and takeover had been guaranteed in 1819 through adjudication by the U.S. Supreme Court of the Dartmouth Case.

Collegiate level technical education began with the founding of the United States Military Academy in 1802 and Rensselaer School in 1824, later known as Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. It was from the latter that institutions throughout the country sought faculty and faculty advice and consultation on programs in science and technology. Beginning in the latter part of the second decade of the 1800s, a period sometimes called the "Period of Awakening" the clamor rose increasingly for not only an expansion of education for the common man but also for different practical types of education geared to the rising industrial and expanding agrarian economy. Expressions of this desire came in the form of the Manual Labor Movement, the County Agricultural Societies, and organizations of working men. Already in 1854, Pennsylvania had established a state agricultural school which opened in 1859. A similar action had been taken in Michigan in 1855 and the Michigan State College of Agriculture began operation in 1857. Petitions to the Federal Government for assistance had come from numerous sources. Although President Buchanan vetoed an earlier bill, Congress passed in 1862 an act (Morrill Act) creating a system of land grant colleges and giving states larger grants of land than had been originally proposed in the defeated earlier bill. With the advent of monies and grants of land, this new type of institution, of which there were 65 in 1900, quickly came into existence to serve the new educational, research, and service needs of a growing technological industrial and expanding agrarian society. Subsequently, the Hatch Act of 1887 authorized year-round Agricultural Research and Experimentation, and the second Morrill Act of 1890 provided additional funding to these institutions.[4]

By the year 1899-1900, there were 977 institutions of higher education with 237,592 resident degree credit enrollments. This was a thirty-year increase of 73.5 percent in number of institutions and 354.4 percent in numbers of students.[5] During the decade prior to 1900, the total number of undergraduate and resident graduate students in colleges and universities for men and for both sexes, for women in Division A institutions as classified by the U.S. Commissioner, and in schools of technology had increased 60.6 percent for men and 148.7 percent for women.[6]

University Extension[7]

That the concept of university extension as a means of diffusing knowledge was not a new idea at the turn of the century was made clear by William T. Harris, the U.S. Commissioner of Education. He reported, "Ten years ago, 1889, the term 'university extension' was a new thing in the United States, but the thing itself was old."[8] Reference was made to the activities of Professor Benjamin Silliman of Yale College, who in 1808 had offered lectures in chemistry to New Haven popular audiences. Later he gave lectures in geology at Hartford, Lowell, Salem, and Boston.

University professors were widely involved in Chautauqua and lyceum activities, and other professors such as Professor Silliman, lectured in the vicinity of where their college was located and elsewhere for public edification. However, the subject of university extension as such was first publicly presented at an 1887 meeting of the American Library Association. During the 1888-1899 year, the librarian of Columbia University presented a plan to the Regents for university extension to be done in connection with public libraries. One year later, a committee of New York colleges and universities urged the Regents to establish, under state supervision, a system of extension teaching and that the State would work through existing colleges and institutions. The next year, 1891, an appropriation of $10,000 for the state organization of university extension was the first ever. Subsequently, there developed rapidly a two-pronged approach of public instruction from Albany. One was university extension from the Albany Center or popular education by lectures controlled by university authority. The other was library extension from Albany or popular education by means of well-selected classified libraries in connection with local lectures and home-study clubs designed to fit local needs. In 1891, the University of the State of New York made extension one of its five departments. The department included, ". . . (1) public libraries and traveling libraries; (2) extension teaching, outside regular schools and colleges, or 'university extension,' (3) study clubs, for associate study and discussion of a common series of topics; (4) summer schools."[9] Under Albany auspices during the 1899 school year, 36 extension lecture courses were offered at 12 different centers as compared with 21 courses at 13 centers the year before.

In his report for the 1899-1900 year, the U.S. Commissioner of Education cited the New York Center at Albany along with the American Society for Extension Teaching (Philadelphia) and the University of Chicago as being among the most active and influential points of departure for American university extension. The University of the State of New York included under the heading of extension teaching all instruction under the immediate supervision of a university teacher other than regular term resident campus classes, extension lecture courses, free lectures to people, institutes both social and general, correspondence instruction, summer schools, and vacation and evening schools. Regarding the Philadelphia extension effort, the U.S. Commissioner wrote, "This city and the whole region around about have been quickened to new intellectual life and social activity by university extension since its organization in 1890."[10] He praised the Society leaders for marshalling the energy and enthusiasm, self-sacrifice, devotion to duty, quick insight and skillful direction for the extension of university teaching. Experienced English lecturers were invited to lend their expertise to the new popular educational cause, and in 1899, lecture courses were given in 14 different Philadelphia locations and in 29 other different towns situated both in Pennsylvania and in neighboring states.

When the University of Chicago opened in October 1892, the university extension division was one of the main branches of educational effort. Like the Philadelphia Society, the University of Chicago enjoyed the hearty cooperation of all friends and promoters of the extension movement. President Harper retained early the services of eminent professors from other universities, and among them was Professor R. G. Moulton, one of the most experienced English lecturers. Harper attracted at least two experienced directors of university extension work from Philadelphia. The U.S. Commissioner reported that with assistance of university extension and its superior pedagogical methods and flexibility for adapting to local needs, the president had built up his academic resources and made the institution well known not only to Chicago people but also to people in surrounding towns, schools, colleges, libraries, and churches. Included under the extension division was all nonresident work, such as lecture study courses, correspondence courses, study clubs, and evening and Saturday classes. Lecture courses were given in cooperation with existing literary organizations. For the year ending in June 1898, 141 courses each of six lecture studies had been given in 92 different centers with an aggregate attendance of 30,315. With cooperation of local libraries, the university sent out small traveling libraries containing in all 3,562 books. In cooperation with the local Chicago schools, 17 courses had been held in 13 different public schools, and of the courses, 10 were systematic university extension lecture studies. In its short period of existence, the University of Chicago had extended its power and influence well beyond state lines and was quickly developing a vast academic and national alliance under Harper's extension policy.

Note was also made by the Commissioner that for a number of years under university auspices, in addition to regular courses of instruction under each faculty, the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. had offered courses of lectures to the public. By 1900, the practice of offering university extension work as a legitimate part of a university function had become well entrenched and accepted.

Development of Teacher Education

Qualifications of teachers in the early public schools often consisted of good moral character, meager education, and ability to keep order, even to the point of being able to subdue the larger class members who became unruly. Schoolkeeping rather than school teaching was the typical mode of operation. Prior to 1865, a great majority of the teachers in common schools had been trained in private academies. Academy programs for the purpose had been influenced by private normal schools with programs patterned after the French and Prussian schools by scholars who studied in Europe. In 1870, of 6,871,522 pupils in public schools, 99 percent were in elementary schools, so teacher preparation was confined primarily to teachers of elementary schools.[11]

Normal Schools

The first schools designed to provide teachers with the rules or models of teaching (normal) were private such as those promoted in Concord, Vermont in 1823 by Samuel R. Hall and in Lancaster, Massachusetts in 1827 by James O. Carter. After considerable agitation to improve the qualifications of teachers, the first normal school under state auspices in America was opened in Lexington, Massachusetts in July 1839 with three pupils under the principalship of Cyrus

Peirce.[12]

By 1840, two additional normal schools had been opened in Massachusetts. By 1860, twelve state-supported normal schools had been established in Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, Michigan, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota; the first city normal school had been established in St. Louis; and, six private normal schools had been organized for the same purpose. By 1865, there were 18 state normal schools. Following 1865, there was a rapid growth of both public and private normal schools until 1895 when the growth of private normal schools began to decline sharply.[13] The decline occurred as states entered more extensively into the field of teacher preparation.

The State Constitution of North Carolina adopted in 1876 provided for the training of teachers in two normal schools, one for each race. The legislature specified that the school for white teachers would be attached to the state university. Although it was the intention of authorities responsible for allocating monies that the training of white males would be established during the regular academic year, an agent of the Peabody Fund persuaded those in charge to conduct a normal school during the 1877 university summer vacation period open to both sexes. Teacher training for white teachers was conducted as a six week's summer normal open not only to those desiring to become teachers but also to persons already engaged in teaching. Financial inducements such as free dormitory rooms, half-fares granted by the railroads, and cheap eating arrangements were offered teachers, and two major North Carolina newspapers reported the opening with great fanfare. The university normal school opened with six instructors and 235 students, of which 128 were men, representing 42 counties of the state. By 1881, the school had eighteen faculty members, officers, and instructors and served 338 students of which 170 were men. In 1884 the summer normal was discontinued when the state with held some funds from the university and the Peabody Fund did not renew its funding support.[14]

However, before the summer normal was abandoned, arrangements were underway by the university to institute a two-year Teachers' Course during the academic year. In 1885 the Teachers' Course became a School of Normal Instruction. Thus the University of North Carolina developed the first public university summer normal school.

Not only was there growth in numbers of teacher training schools during the last 25 years of the 1800s, but with the beginnings of the scientific study and approach to education, the nature of the instruction changed from only how to organize and discipline a school to include the introduction of instructional techniques consonant with the development of knowledge about child growth and development and how children learn. Courses in state-supported normal schools had increased in length to two and three years and in some cases four years. In colleges and universities, normal departments were being converted to departments of pedagogy and education. Summer schools for teachers which had begun in 1872 had become quite widely adopted and increased to over 100 by 1890.

By the 1899-1900 school year, there were 1,476 normal schools distributed by type as follows:

Public Normal	172	Public High School	506
Private Normal	134	Private High School	417
Public University/College	26	Private University/College	221

Public institutions enrolled 61 percent of all normal school students, and of all students, 26 percent were men. Of the 172 public normal schools, about one-fourth were located in New York (16), Pennsylvania (15), and Massachusetts (10). Twelve states and territories had only one public normal school apiece. About 45 percent of the 134 private normal schools were located in twelve North Central states, and 48 percent were found in the South Atlantic states from Delaware to Florida and in the South Central states from Kentucky-Arkansas-Oklahoma to the Gulf. The territory north and northeast of New Jersey and Pennsylvania had only seven, and the eleven states in the Rocky Mountain region and west had only two. Except for programs in colleges and universities, most were secondary level educational institutions. In all teacher education curricula, standards were so low that until after 1900 the typical teacher did not have a high school education.[15]

Teachers' Institutes

Closely paralleling the establishment of normal schools during the 1840s and 1850s and persisting well beyond the 1899-1900 year was the development of teachers' institutes. The primary function of a normal school (usually 3-8 weeks) was the academic and professional training of teachers. Teachers' meetings typically lasted one or two days for the purposes of coordinating activities within a given administrative unit, keeping teachers abreast of current practice and educational thought, and helping teachers in their work and to improve their teaching at specific points. The teachers' institute typically lasted 3-10 days and attempted to accomplish the conglomerate functions of the other kinds of meetings.

In 1839, Henry Barnard held the first teachers' institute at Hartford, Connecticut when he asembled 26 young men for six weeks of lectures and observations conducted in the public schools. The next year, a similar arrangement was made for women teachers. While this action is cited by some as the beginning of teachers' institutes in the United States, others, Horace Mann included, cited a two-week meeting for teachers held in 1843 by the Superintendent of Schools in Tompkins County, New York as the beginning. Subsequent to the success of the 1843 meeting, the practice spread rapidly throughout New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts.[16] Prior to 1865, the teachers' institute was the most important means of organized in-service education, and they were fairly common in all parts of the country except the southern section.

By 1885, the aims, purposes, and methods of conducting teachers' institutes was exceedingly diverse among the states. An evaluative judgment rendered was that, as a whole, the institutes had accomplished good things and probably cost less than they were worth but, stemming from a lack of thorough organization and professional management, only a part of their potential had been realized. The Commissioner of Education wrote, "The facts presented in this report show that institutes often may not only be valueless practically, but (also) a positive source of mischief to the teachers and to the schools."[17]

Institutes arose to serve a distinct need in the training of teachers before normal school development had gained much headway and before summer schools for teachers had begun. They were seldom less than two weeks in length and served a temporary makeshift approach to the training and improvement of teachers until a more adequate system had been evolved. In many states, the institute was the prime, if not the only, means of educating rural teachers for several decades before the turn of the century.

University Departments of Education

While the incorporation of teacher education into established colleges or universities occurred prior to 1865 in such institutions as the University of Michigan, New York University, Brown, and Washington College (PA), the principal stimulus came after the war between the states from demands for high school teachers. The University of Iowa established in 1873 the first permanent university chair of education. This action developed from a specific provision in the 1855 founding legislation for a normal department and also served as a forerunner to the establishment of a school of education 34 years later. The University of Michigan established a permanent chair of the science and art of teaching in 1897. Other institutions such as the University of Wisconsin (1885), Indiana University (1886), and Cornell University (1886) created similar chairs or departments. Ten institutions had chairs or departments of pedagogy or education by

1891. After 1891, the number rose from a mere handful to about 250 by 1900. In addition, liberal arts colleges began teacher education programs, and by the year 1889-1900, over one-fourth of them were offering regular courses in education. Among the early private institutions to offer *courses in psychology and education were Johns Hopkins and Clark Universities.*[18]

Development of Teachers Colleges

The Michigan State normal school, established in Ypsilanti in 1849, was reorganized in 1890 as the first public normal school to become a teachers college. Stimulated by a convergence of various influences which were present prior to 1900, the movement to convert normal schools to teachers colleges developed slowly but definitely during the next 20 years. This was due to rapid increases of high school graduates after 1890, the increasing respectability of education since its acceptance as a legitimate part of a university curriculum, the influence of accrediting associations, and concern of boards of education and educational leaders as to the quality and kind of education schools were providing. By 1900 some teacher education programs had been extended to four years.[19]

Non-Formal Educational Antecedents

After England was no longer threatened by its arch enemy Napoleon and the societal restrictions consonant with such a threat, there was in the early half of the 1800s almost at once a great ground swell of interest in popular education for adults as well as youth. Much of the enthusiasm and desire in England impacted on American society, and some tried and tested methods were readily borrowed. Beginning the latter part of the first quarter of the 1800s and continuing through the century, there was likewise in America a growing social consciousness accompanied by heightened interest and demands for popular education. Some of the reasons were indigenous to the developing society. With the onset of the Jacksonian period in which a democratic social philosophy was espoused that broke away from the previous elitist and aristocratic approaches, sufferage was extended and heavy emphasis was placed on education for the common man. It was in this era that the ideas of free public secular schools began to take hold. Various kinds of non-formal but organized educational movements were begun. Among them were the Lyceum, Chautauqua, and summer school movements.

Lyceum

The American Lyceum (popular education by local lecturers) was one of the goodly group of institutes, libraries, museums, and other schools for the diffusion of knowledge among all people which sprang from the democratic influence of the American and French Revolutions. The first American Lyceum founded in New York City in 1831 was a federation of state and local types. Both Lyceums and institutes were American extensions of popular English movements for the diffusion of knowledge. The Lyceum was closely connected with the general advance of free public education, the education of teachers, and the extension of libraries first in the schools and next in the towns and cities. The idea was possibly fostered by a meeting in 1826 at Milbury, Massachusetts at which 30-40 farmers and mechanics met to organize a society for the diffusion of knowledge. Over a dozen other towns followed the example, and the system soon spread westward and throughout New England.

The Lyceum had several characteristics worth noting. It was a voluntary social institution. It was self-adapting to the prevalent interest of its members. Most of all, it was apolitical, but republican and patriotic. It was a benevolent and Christian institution to which teachers were expected to and did contribute time, effort, and skill as a normal part of their life in a community.[20] The avowed purpose was the advancement of education in the common schools and the general diffusion of knowledge. Another purpose was to build public sentiment for the support of free tax-supported public schools. Types of Lyceums were those associated with a town, district, village, county, state, or the nation. Means for accomplishing the objectives were weekly meetings for reading, conversation, discussions, dissertations, debates, and scientific illustrations. Lectures and discussions were often extemporaneous, but they were sometimes elaborated by local home talent using citations from good authorities. The national movement came to an end around 1839, although many State Lyceums continued until 1845 or later, and their activities were more narrowly limited to a yearly lecture course.

Chautauqua

In medieval England, a general assembly of the people of a town, district or shire was known as a folkmate. The Franks, one of a number of Germanic tribes inhabiting the Rhine region in the early Christian era had designated an open-air assembly as a folkmate. The educational adaptation of the idea of the folkmate manifested itself in America in the form of mass meetings, popular conventions or New England town meetings. In the southern states, a religious outgrowth of the folkmate concept was the camp meeting, and in the north it was the Chautauqua. The name Chautauqua is at once a place, an institution, and an idea.[21]

As a place, Fairpoint (now known as Chautauqua) was a small summer town situated 70 miles south of Buffalo in the southwestern part of New York on Lake Chautauqua, a beautiful lake 18 miles long and ranging from one to three miles wide. The lake situated 730 feet above Lake

Erie and 1,400 feet above sea level on one of the highlands of New York provides a natural divide between the northeastward flow of waters with the St. Lawrence from the great Lakes region and the southwestward flow to the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. At this scenic spot, on the site of a previous Methodist camp, the first Chautauqua Lake Assembly was held in 1874. The Assembly, established as a summer camp for the education of Sunday-school teachers in a way similar to normal schools for public school teachers, took the name of the lake, named by the Indians as Chautauqua. In 1981, the town had approximately 400 year-round residents, but in summer, it is a vast encampment with a cottage and hotel population ranging from 2,000-3,000 to 10,000 people. About 7,000 people stay for a week, month, or all summer and 2,000 came for one day.[22]

> Amid, the multiform developments of modern Chautauqua, the observer should hold closely to the original and central idea of a summer meeting for popular educational and religious purposes. The institution is a camp meeting for culture and religion. Bible study and biblical training of Sunday-school teachers were originally and still are dominant educational features. When General Grant visited Chautauqua, the chancellor publicly presented him with a Bible. Grant took it, but characteristically said nothing. The control of the institution is in the hands of a legal corporation representing religious as well as secular interests. The work is not carried on for pecuniary profit to the stockholders, but primarily for philanthropic purposes and for Christian popular education.[23]

In 1878, the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle was founded. The primary purpose was to foster a system of home reading in literature and science through local reading circles. During the 20 years prior to 1900, there were about 10,000 local reading circles enrolling approximately a quarter of a million persons. Persons completing the four-year reading course were granted a certificate attesting the achievement. In 1883, the Chautauqua Institution was chartered by New York State as a degree-granting institution, but a decade later they relinquished the designation to concentrate on broad cultural studies. In 1900, there were more than 300 Chautauquas scattered throughout the United States and Canada. After falling upon hard times financially during this century and having successfully coped with need for facilities renovations, a modern renaissance has been reported.[24]

Organizations for Educational Purposes

During the second quarter of the 1800s, a large number of organizations consisting chiefly of public spirited citizens were spawned for awakening and building public sentiment to support a system of public tax-supported schools. Hundreds of School Societies, Lyceums, and Educational Associations were organized resulting in many conventions from which resolutions were adopted and passed on to state legislatures supporting state schools. Some of these, such as the American Lyceum, the Western Literary Institute and College of Professional Teachers, which served the central Mississippi Valley and Southern States from headquarters in Cincinnati, and the American Institute of Education serving the New England region from Boston, had intentionally included teachers and educational leaders as well as lay citizens.[25]

Between the demise of the American Lyceum Association (1839) and the Western Literary Institute (1845) and 1860, there were several transitory associations such as the National Association of the Friends of Education (1849), the American Association for the Advancement of Education (1850), and the National Teachers Association (1857) concerned with the profession of teaching and designed for teachers and administrators. The latter was to be primarily for teachers rather than college professors, administrators, and public spirited citizens. The American Normal School Association was created in 1858, and in 1866, the National Association of School Superintendents was organized. From an amalgamation of these associations, the National Education Association was incorporated in 1870 with departments of School Superintendence, Normal Schools, Elementary Schools, and Higher Education.

Prior to 1900, the membership of the National Education Association fluctuated greatly, and the organization was beset with financial difficulties. The new association was used by many well-known educational leaders as a forum for discussion of the latest in educational thought and controversy. Two years before the turn of the century, a position of permanent Secretary was created, and an office and staff was provided.

Following the creation of the first state teacher's association in Rhode Island in 1844 and additional ones the same year in New York and Massachusetts, by 1856, such associations had been established in fourteen other states. This movement continued among the states as numbers of public school students, teachers, and schools increased markedly.

Reform and Quality

During the 1890s, preceding 1900, two major forces were converging which would impact until today the established system of public education. One was a fomenting concern about the need for reforms to improve the content taught, methods used, and organization and a clamor for improved quality and articulation of college and secondary education. With stimulation from Harvard President, Charles W. Eliot, and others, three important study committees were appointed by the National Education Association. They were the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies (1891), the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education (1893), and the Committee on

College Entrance Requirements (1895), all of which reported their findings by 1899.

The other action was the creation of voluntary regional standardizing and accrediting associations for secondary and collegiate institutions. The New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory schools had been organized in 1885, and the Middle States Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools in 1892. With the creation of the North Central and Southern Associations of College and Secondary Schools in 1895, a precedent was set for the nation in voluntary cooperative maintenance and improvement of quality in secondary schools and colleges.

Evolution of Summer Schools

After more than twenty-five years' experience with Chautauquas, the U.S. Commissioner of Education wrote, "The original Chautauqua is undoubtedly the most popular and best known type of American summer schools. Its example influenced the development of very many others . . . we may best characterize all Chautauquas as religious summer schools."[26] Although the 1874 meeting was an educational assembly with the purpose of promoting higher and better Sunday-school work, the educational effort was extended over many other fields. The Chautauqua apparently accommodated the public interest in education in a setting and under conditions appealing to adults.

One year before the Chautauqua Assembly gathered, a Harvard professor, Louis Agassiz, conducted a scientific summer school on Penikese Island off Newport, Rhode Island for teachers who prepared to introduce the study of natural science into their schools and students preparing to become teachers. This effort led to a succession of similar schools of natural sciences.

The idea of general training for teachers in a scientific field, in contrast to specialized pedagogical training, had begun in 1869 when Professor Agassiz experimented with a summer geological school taught in part in Cambridge and in part in western Massachusetts. The same year a dozen professors and students journeyed to Colorado where scientific studies were made and specimens collected. Over the next four years, parties of Yale University students and professors travelled to the Rocky Mountains on scientific expeditions. The efforts at Harvard followed a practice begun there as early as 1863 of giving Saturday university campus lectures for the special benefit of teachers in the secondary schools. Although experiments with Saturday lectures and off-campus summer instruction had been conducted, the first probable idea of a permanent summer school was embodied in Professor Agassiz's effort in 1872 to establish and maintain a seaside laboratory on Penikese Island in Buzzard's Bay for both the benefit of Harvard University students and of secondary school science teachers. It seems that Harvard College had been the first to recognize the obligations of colleges and universities to students whose circumstances prevented them from attending courses during the regular terms.

In 1874, Harvard University established courses of summer instruction for six weeks duration under the direction of a committee appointed by the President and Fellows. The purpose was to afford students an opportunity during the vacation period to pursue studies in certain subjects as would aid them in their work as teachers or in their preparation for advanced courses offered during regular terms. By 1886, seventy-six students enrolled for summer courses of which 58 percent were teachers. However, by 1889, of the 188 students enrolled, 61 percent were teachers. During that summer, offerings consisted of five chemistry courses, a course in experimental physics and botany, elementary and advanced courses in geology, and courses in topography, French, German, and physical training.[27]

During the last quarter of the 1800s, summer instruction was offered by several universities with courses for teachers.[28] More than 100 summer schools or summer sessions were held in 1890 by colleges or universities, religious groups or gatherings, Chautauqua groups, teachers assemblies, and many other agencies. Teacher education was stressed in many places. It was a common practice for college students to teach part of a year, usually during the winter, to help with expenses. Mount Union College discovered that of 7,019 students who had attended, 74.6 percent had devoted part of the year to teaching, usually a winter term. Under the usual fall, winter, spring quarter system, students who taught during the winter quarter became irregular in their studies and often discouraged about the expense and time it would take them to finish their studies. To better accommodate the majority of their students, in 1870, Mount Union College arranged their course schedule and calendar so that a full complement of courses required for graduation could be taken in the fall, spring, and summer quarters by students who chose to teach during the winter quarter. Such classes as those students on campus wanted were offered during winter quarter. Thus, for students who worked during the summer period as well as those who taught school during the winter period, the program of studies could be completed in four years. The summer quarter was May 11 to July 27, after which there was a three and one-half weeks vacation before fall quarter began. The implementation of the summer quarter by this undergraduate college was probably the first instance in which a collegiate institution in the United States developed a summer session as part of a year-round degree oriented program.

In 1900, the U.S. Commissioner of Education reported that due to professors' involvement in the Chautauqua summer assemblies and lyceums, some colleges and universities had long been encouraging summer schools on their own premises. By then, Harvard had developed a great variety of summer courses as had the Universities of Virginia, Indiana, Wisconsin, and many other state institutions. The Commissioner stated, "The Harvard faculty have recently noted that work done in the summer schools may, with the consent of the various departments, be counted as regular work toward the degree of A.B."[29]

Study in a variety of summer school types had become common by 1894-95, when the different types were roughly classified according to phases of education with which they dealt.[30] They were classified as (1) schools teaching specialized branches of knowledge such as ancient and modern languages, philosophy, literature, psychology, natural sciences, law, and medicine; (2) schools of the arts, such as drawing, industrial arts, music, expression, oratory, and physical training; (3) professional schools of pedagogy; (4) Chautauqua where study was united with rest and recreation and where the home study courses were made the basis of educational activity; and (5) general, where all or most subjects in the general curriculum of education were taught. By control, the schools could be classified as (1) private, which ranged in scope from a school preparing students for college or making up deficiencies to those specializing in chemistry, law, or Bible study; (2) colleges or universities which were usually more general in character; and (3) state summer schools generally devoted to teacher training that were more or less local and even migratory in character. Financially, summer schools ranged from private operations with fees sufficient to make them self-supporting to public state schools which were free. Terms varied from a few days to three months. To begin with, it was customary to give many short courses or single lectures, but by 1895, it was the custom to make the courses or lectures as continuous and connected as possible. A trend was to increase the length of time and to make as much use of the vacation period as possible.

Another notable summer school effort was the Catholic Summer School of America, which was finally located at Plattsburg, New York on Lake Champlain after meeting various places for about a decade. In 1893, this school received a charter from the regents of the University of the State of New York. The charter gave certain advantages to summer school students who wished to prepare for the regents' or State's examinations. Instruction at this Catholic Chautauqua was given in anthropology, history, literature, ethics, science and religion. A Jewish Chautauqua, located in Atlantic City, after only three years of existence by 1900, enrolled over 2,000 members in local circles of Canada and the United States.

Chautauqua as an idea was truly catholic in its appeal, and its impact has been lasting in the history of American education. In 1900, the Commissioner of Education described Chautauqua as the most democratic and largely-attended summer school and the earliest continuous school of the kind in the world.

The Martha's Vineyard Summer Institute, founded in 1878 by Colonel Homer B. Sprague, headmaster of a girls high school in Boston, became one of the leading and most flourishing institutes for summer instruction. The institute was conceived to serve teachers and others during a portion of the long summer vacation period, and about 80 students were attracted the first year for the five-week session. By 1890, the enrollment was 700, including teachers of all grades from kindergarten to college and from thirty-seven states, provinces, territories, and countries. More than fifty different courses were offered in a school of methods for elementary studies, a school of methods for high-school studies, a school of elocution and oratory, and eighteen academic departments. The scope of offerings is revealed by the departments, namely: natural sciences; modern languages; ancient languages; mathematics; English literature, history, civil government; vocal and instrumental music; drawing; microscopy; painting; and sloyd. By 1891, five buildings had been acquired through donations.

The University of Chicago Innovation

One of the innovations in higher education inaugurated by William Rainey Harper, founder and President of the University of Chicago in 1892, was the four-quarter calendar. The Commissioner of Education report in 1899-1900 described this innovation as follows:

> The most remarkable and most recent development of the summer school idea in America is that of the fourth quarter of summer term at the University of Chicago, where academic work goes straight on throughout the year (forty-eight weeks) like any other business. President Harper, for many years principal of Chautauqua, was probably influenced by its example in devising his plan for a university course. The result of his excellent policy is that while most American colleges and universities rest or go to sleep in summer time, Chicago is drawing students and professors from nearly all of them. Many Chicago professors arrange to take their long vacation in the winter or spring. Outside seekers after academic knowledge can, therefore, find good men at their Chicago post in the mid-summer term. Thus, the summer school idea has been fully incorporated by a vigorous and progressive American university.[31]

The way this development differed from all other summer periods of instruction which had been offered previously was that, for the first time, a comprehensive type university had implemented a summer quarter with the same breadth of offerings as in any other quarter.[32]

Summary of Educational Development Prior to the Twentieth Century

When the turn of the century occurred, there was considerable foment for change and improvement of an educational system which had just been put in place. The battle and struggle for a free tax-supported common school system for youth through secondary school had been won and legalized. This system had replaced primarily private effort. The ground swell of public faith and interest in education for the common citizen begun toward the end of the first quarter of the 1800s was manifesting itself everywhere during the last quarter in greatly increased enrollments at the elementary-secondary school and collegiate levels. Earlier Educational Societies, including the American Lyceum, composed primarily of lay public-spirited citizens interested in acquiring a democratic educational system were replaced by professionally oriented associations consisting primarily of college faculty, teachers and school officials working for the improvement of education and educational conditions.

The collegiate system of education had expanded to include not only private colleges and universities, but also state-supported universities, land-grant agricultural and mechanical colleges, state and privately supported normal schools, and a few state supported teachers colleges converted from normal schools.

Qualifications of teachers which were primarily based on moral character and ability to discipline and keep order as late as the 1830s had become a matter of increasing concern. Until 1865, the few with academic qualifications had received their training in secondary school level academies, public and private high schools, city, county or state normal schools, or private normal schools, most of which were secondary level schools. The meager training for most consisted of attendance at a wide ranging variety of short-term teachers' institutes and state and local teachers' association meetings and conventions.

During the last three decades of the 1800s, there was a rapid increase in establishment of normal schools, normal programs in high schools, and, due to rapid development of need for high school teachers, the establishment of teacher education programs in four-year public and private colleges and universities. As the century came to a close, the validity of teachers' institutes was being questioned and a movement had begun to convert public collegiate level normal schools to colleges in name and function with the development of strengthened liberal arts and science curriculums in those institutions.

The Chautauqua idea of summer study had expanded throughout the country, largely replacing the Lyceum. The idea of summer study, particularly in scientific fields pioneered by Harvard College, had become an accepted practice in other fields as well and was being implemented in a variety of forms, including teacher training in professional schools of pedagogy and state summer schools. A full curriculum quarter equivalent to other term quarters had been implemented for the first time as an innovation in higher education by a comprehensive American university. Extension services as a legitimate function of a university had been accepted and legalized.

Chapter 2 -- Endnotes

1. Good accounts of the early historical development of public education are available in many books. Among these are R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin, A History of Education in American Culture (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953); Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States (Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934); Edgar W. Knight, Twenty Centuries of Education (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1940); and John D. Russell and Charles H. Judd, The American Educational System (Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company,1940).

2. U.S. Bureau of Education, A Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year Ending June 30, 1904, Volume II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1906), 1782-1989; U.S. Bureau of Education, A Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901), Volume I, Chapter 5 and Volume II, 2129.

3. W. B. W. Martin and A. J. MacDonell, Canadian Education: A Sociological Analysis (Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall of Canada, Ltd., 1978); Samuel E. Morison, Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936).

4. Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States (Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934), 264-281.

5. National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics, 1983-84 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983), 101.

6. U.S. Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900. Volume I, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901), 48.

7. Most of the information in this section has been adapted from U.S. Bureau of Education, "Educational Extension in the United States," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900, Volume I, Chapter 5.

8. Ibid., 299.

9. Ibid., 303.

10. Ibid., 306.

11. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin, A History of Education in American Culture, 286-287; 449-453.

12. U.S. Bureau of Education, Rise and Growth of the Normal School Idea in the United States, by J. P. Gordy, Circular of Information No. 8, 1891 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1891), 1-145; U.S. Department of Education, "State Normal Schools," Report of the Commissioner of Education, by Henry Barnard, Special Circular No. 10, 1867 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1868), 659.

13. Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States, 380-402; U.S. Office of Education, "Establishment and Growth of Normal Schools and Normal Departments in Colleges and Universities from 1839 to 1865," National Survey of the Education of Teachers, by Benjamin Frazier, et al., Bulletin 1933, No. 10, Volume V, Chapter 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935), 10-23.

14. Ruth E. Coyner, "The South's First University Summer Normal School," Peabody Journal of Education 18 (September 1940):173-182.

15. U.S. Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900, Volume II, 1068-2117; U.S. Office of Education, National Survey of the Education of Teachers, by E. S. Evenden, Bulletin, 1933, No. 10, Volume VI (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935), 30.

16. U.S. Bureau of Education, "Teachers Institutes," by James H. Smart. Circulars of Information, Circular No. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1885); "Teachers Institutes," by William C. Ruediger, Agencies for the Improvement of Teachers in Service, Bulletin No. 3 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1911), 10-41.

17. U.S. Bureau of Education, "Teachers Institutes," Circulars of Information of the Bureau of Education, Circular No. 2, 1885, 6.

18. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin, A History of Education in American Culture, 448-457.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid., 285; Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States, 168.

21. Material in this section was largely adapted from U.S. Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900, Volume I, 1901, 313ff; John H. Vincent, The Chautauqua Movement (Boston: Chautauqua Press, 1886); U.S. Bureau of Education, "Chautauqua: A Social and Educational Study," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1894-1895, Volume 1, Chapter 19 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1986), 977-1077; and U.S. Bureau of Education, "Chautauqua," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1891-92, Volume 1, Chapter 29 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1894), 921-45.

22. Beverly T. Watkins, "Renaissance at Chautauqua." The Chronicle of Higher Education (23 September 1981):4-5.

23. U.S. Bureau of Education, "Chautauqua: A Social and Educational Study," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1894-1895, Volume I, 315.

24. Watkins, loc. cit.

25. Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States, 542-544; Edgar W. Knight, Twenty Centuries of Education, 414-415.

26. U.S. Bureau of Education, "Select Types of Summer Schools," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900, Volume I (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901), 322; U.S. Office of Education, "Rapid Growth of Normal Schools and Beginnings of Departments of Pedagogy, 1865-90," National Survey of the Education of Teachers, by Benjamin W. Frazier, et al., Bulletin 1933, No. 10, Volume V, Chapter 3 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935), 37-38.

27. U.S. Bureau of Education, History of Higher Education in Massachusetts by George G. Bush, Circular of Information No. 6, 1891, Contributions to American Educational History No. 13 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1891), 184-5.

28. Watson Dickerman, "The Historical Development of the Summer Session in Higher Institutions in the United States" (Ph.D. disseration, University of Chicago, 1945), 99ff.

29. U.S. Bureau of Education, "Select Types of Summer Schools," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Years 1899-1900, Volume I, 302.

30. U.S. Bureau of Education, "A Checklist of American Summer Schools," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1894-95, Volume II, Chapter 36, 1483-1503; U.S. Bureau of Education, "The History of Summer Schools in the United States," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1891-92, by W. W. Willoughby, Volume II, Chapter 29 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1894), 893-959.

31. U.S. Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900, Volume 1, 322-323.

32. For a detailed account of summer period activities derived from primary sources, see Watson Dickerman, "The Historical Development of the Summer Session in Higher Institutions in the United States" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1945).

CHAPTER 3

THE ERA OF EDUCATIONAL GROWTH AND EXPANSION

Introduction

Significant trends impacting the higher educational system between 1900 and the 1980s and projections of selected trends to the end of the century and beyond are presented in this chapter. Many of the developments germinated during the 1800s, and some of them were touched on briefly in Chapter 2. It is a truism that today's educational conditions are all a part of what they have been previously, and what they are likely to be in the years ahead are in large measure an extension of what they are today. From the myriad of factors that could be given attention, both in society at large and within the educational system, only those that seemed most pertinent to the development of college and university summer sessions were singled out for inclusion here.

The rapid growth and expansion of the educational system after 1900, and the development of provisions for teacher education and for other adults are traced. It is in this context that collegiate summer sessions materialized and have waxed or waned throughout this century.

Demographic Changes

People have for economic and other reasons become increasingly more geographically mobile since 1900. Constant improvements in auto locomotion and advent of a national system of interstate road systems have contributed greatly to this mobility. Whereas in 1900, slightly over two of every ten (20.6%) persons enumerated by the census were born in some state other than where they lived, by 1980 the number had risen to slightly over three of every ten (30.8%)[1]

People in general are living longer and have more years than previously to live after retirement. Life expectancy at birth for all citizens increased from 54.1 years in 1920 to 74.7 years in 1984. Life expectancy for females has always been longer than for males, and in 1984 it was 78.3 years compared to 71.1 years for males.[2]

Between 1900 and 1950, the U.S. population doubled. In 1950, there was an equal percentage of men and women; 11% were non-white; and, 8% were age 65 and over. By the year 2000, the population is expected to have grown at a rate of 76%, the percentage of men to have decreased one percent, the non-white percentage to have increased by two percent, and the percentage of persons age 65 and over to have increased by five percent. During the next 50 years, the total population is expected to increase by 15.2%, the percentage of men to decline by one percent, the percentage of non-whites to increase by four percent, and the percentage of persons age 65 and over to increase by nine percent. By 1980, population had increased to 227,658,000 (49.5% increase) with 51% women, 12% non-white, and 11% age 65 and over. According to middle series of projections, by the year 2030, total population will increase to 304,330,000 (33.7%) with women constituting 48%, non-whites 16%, and persons age 65 and over 21 percent.[3]

In 1950, persons age 18-24 constituted 10.6% of the total population, and of these, 11.8% were non-white. In the year 2000, there is expected to be an increase of 52.9% of persons age 18-24 of which 19.4% will be non-white persons. That age group will represent nine percent of the total population, and by the year 2050, that age group is expected to have increased by four percent and to constitute slightly over eight percent of the total population. One-fourth are expected to be non-white.[4]

Educational Trends

Over the past eight decades, there have been significant structural and sociological changes impacting both the educational system and conditions of life in the United States. A few of these are depicted by data presented in Table 1. At the turn of the century, the rural landscape was dotted with one-teacher, one-room schools each located within daily walking distance of where elementary school age children lived on the farms. These schools provided elementary education from seven to eight years duration, and graduates who attended high school did so by going to the nearest village where there was a school. Since, in many instances, road conditions were poor for daily commuting purposes and distances prohibited walking, students often boarded in town to attend high school during the period between harvesting and planting. For reasons touched on elsewhere, a movement began after the turn of the century to replace this rural system of elementary education by the reorganization of small districts through annexation and consolidation into larger multi-teacher graded schools. One can observe the sharp decline in numbers of one-teacher schools during and after the 1940s. During the decades of the 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s percentages of decline were 47, 66, 91, and 50 percentages respectively.

Elementary and Secondary Schools

Shown in Table 1 are the enrollments in public and non-public elementary and secondary schools between 1900 and fall 1988. The growth in enrollments was 166 percent. From 1900 to 1970, the percentage of persons age 17 who were high school graduates increased from 6.4% to 75.9 percent. Increasingly, until after 1970 larger percentages of school age persons stayed in school through secondary school. This condition was in no small measure due to the widespread adoption by states of compulsory education laws to age 16 or 17. Since the 1970s there has been a slight decline in the percentage to about 74 percent.

Between 1889-90 and 1899-1900, the number of public high schools had increased by 137%, and enrollments increased by 156 percent. Between the 1899-1900 and 1910-1911 school years, the number of public high schools increased over 70%, while enrollments increased nearly 90 percent. During the first decade of this period, the number of private high schools increased 21%, and enrollments increased 17 percent. During the latter decade, the number of private high schools declined then rose again to equal the number at the start of the decade, while enrollments increased by nearly 18 percent.

TABLE 1

COMMON SCHOOL AND HIGHER EDUCATION TRENDS[5]

Year	No. Public One-Tcher. Schools (000)	Enrollment Pub/Non-Pub Elem/Sec (000)	Percent Age 17 HS Grads	No. 4-Yr. Pub/Non-Pub Colleges[a]	Enrollment Resident-Degree Credit 4-Yr. (000)	No. All Col/Univ Pub/Non-Pub
1988	.7	45,438[b]	74.0	2,135	13,162[d]	3,587[c]
1980	.9	46,318[b]	71.8	1,957	12,097[d]	3,231
1970	1.8	51,319[b]	75.9	1,639	8,581[d]	2,525
1960	20.2	41,762[b]	67.9	1,451	3,640[d]	2,008
1950	59.7	28,492	59.0	1,345	2,659	1,851
1940	113.6	28,045	50.0	1,252	1,494	1,708
1930	149.3	28,329	29.0	1,132	1,101	1,409
1920	190.7	23,278	16.8	989	598	1,041
1910	-----	19,372	8.8	766	355	951
1900	-----	17,072	6.4	760	238	977
1890	-----	----	3.5	834	157	998

[a] Excluding medical and dental schools.
[b] Includes Alaska and Hawaii.
[c] Given for 1987.
[d] Includes all resident and extension students during fall term.

In the 1889-90 school year, public high schools represented about 61% of all high schools and enrolled 68% of all high school students. By the 1910-1912 school year, public high schools represented 84% of all high schools and enrolled slightly over 88% of all secondary school students.[6] The trend for the proportion of enrollments to increase in public high schools continued, and by 1980, approximately 93% of all high school youth were in public schools. It has been projected that by the year 2000 the percentage of high school enrollments in non-public schools will be at about the 10 percent level as enrollment decreases are expected to be larger in public than non-public schools.[7]

Higher Education

Other data presented in Table 1 demonstrate the rapid expansion after 1900 of the higher education system, both in terms of numbers of collegiate institutions and in enrollments. Between 1890 and 1910, there was a decrease in numbers of both public and non-public collegiate institutions, but since 1920, the growth in numbers of institutions has been continuous. In part, this growth was due to the new developing system of public two-year colleges. Between 1960 and the fall of the 1980 school year, there were more new collegiate institutions established than for the previous 60-year period. There was a steady increase in the number of four-year public and non-public colleges and universities after the turn of the century following a decline during the preceding decade. During the first 30 years, the number increased by 49 percent. Between 1930 and 1960, there was continuous growth as many state normal schools were converted to teachers colleges and regional universities, and other new public regional universities came into being. Some new, non-public, four-year colleges appeared on the scene, and the total number of institutions increased by nearly 28 percent. By 1988, there had been another 47% increase.

In the year 1899-1900, there were 977 institutions of higher education enrolling 237,592 resident degree credit students. During the ensuing half century, the number of institutions increased almost 90% and the enrollments increased over one-thousand percent. Between 1950 and 1970, the number of institutions increased to 2,525 (36.4%). Enrollments which by 1970 included, in addition to resident degree credit students, extension degree and non-degree enrollments, increased to 8,581,000. Beginning in 1980, branches of universities were added to the count and 3,231 institutions were reported. With master's degree students added to the student count, over 12 million students were reported enrolled. In the 1982-83 year, 3,280 institutions were reported to enroll 12,425,780 students, and by the fall 1987, 3,587 institutions enrolled over 13 million students.[8] In 1981-82, of 1,981 four-year collegiate institutions providing information 82% operated summer sessions. Of the 561 public and 1,420 non-public institutions responding, 95 and 77 percents, respectively, operated a summer session.[9] Such data were not reported for 1989.

By the year 1992, enrollments in all institutions of higher education have been projected to range between 11 and 14.2 million with a medium level projection of 11.8 million. The percentage change between 1982-83 and 1992-93 could range from a decrease of 11.3% to an increase of

14.5%.[10] If the middle level projection materializes, the change would be a decrease of 5 percent.

In 1980, 58% of the total collegiate undergraduate and first professional degree enrollments were in four-year institutions, and 42% were in two-year colleges. By the beginning of the 1990s, it was anticipated 53% would be in four-year institutions, but in 1987 the percentage remained the same. During the 1980s, graduate level enrollments were expected to increase by 7%, while total undergraduate and first professional degree enrollments were expected to decline by about 0.8 percent. An increase of approximately 10% was anticipated in two-year college enrollments, while four-year college enrollments were expected to decrease by approximately 9 percent.[11]

Adult Education

Interest in educational activities of many adults was engendered by such movements as the lyceum, Chautauqua, debating societies, mechanics institutes and the like. The Chautauqua movement alluded to earlier did much to capture the imagination of adults and to stimulate interest in a broad range of fields. During the economic depression of the late 1920s and early 1930s, collegiate enrollments, particularly those in public junior colleges, expanded as adults sought competitive job advantage through additional education and training. The Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act (GI Bill), which provided educational benefits to veterans of military service after World War II, made possible their attendance in educational programs of choice to prepare for entry into gainful occupations. The presence of thousands of adults in the pursuit of education and training popularized the concept of education for adults and served as the forerunner of the lifelong learning concepts.

In 1955, the education of adults had become of enough national interest that the Adult Education Section was established in the U.S. Office of Education. In a short time that office conducted the first national study on the total number of adults who had participated in some form of organized adult education activities.[12] Through the U.S. Bureau of the Census questions devised for the purpose revealed that 9.2 million adults had participated in adult education activities during a prior two-year period, excluding correspondence courses and on-the-job training. The participation rate was 8.6%, including persons age 20-34 enrolled in college part-time and in elementary or secondary schools.

Characteristics of Adult Participants

In 1978, the participation rate of the population age 17 and over in adult education had risen to nearly 12%, and the number was approximately 18.2 million. The 1981 rate was about 13%, and the number had soared to over 21.2 million persons. Between 1978 and 1981, the largest percentage change was in the group age 65 years and over (29.2%) compared to all persons above age 17 (8.5%). Thus, older age citizens had begun to take advantage of educational opportunities for adults. However, of all participants, the largest percentage was of persons age 35-54 (30.3% in 1978; 29.3% in 1981) with persons age 25-34 next.[13]

In 1981, 90% of the participants in adult education were high school graduates compared to 75% in 1959. Between 1959 and 1981, of persons participating in adult education, larger percentages were women and persons with higher education levels. By occupation, there were increases in percentages of service workers (7% to 13%), operatives (11% to 14%), and sales and clerical workers (24% to 25%). Decreases of participation in adult education were found among professional and technical workers (25% to 16%), managers and administrators (11.6% to 11.4%), craftsmen and foremen (13.1% to 12.9%), and laborers and farm workers (8.4% to 7.4%). Larger percentages of participants were white, but the rates of participation increased for both white and non-white groups over a three-year period ending in 1981. Major reasons for participation for both males (54%) and females (37%) were to advance in a job and for personal and social reasons (19% and 34%, respectively).

In both 1959 and 1981, the Western states had the highest adult education participation rates, which were 14.3 and 17.6 percentages, respectively. In 1959, the rate for other sections of the country was approximately 8 percent. By 1981, the participation rates varied among geographical sections with participation rates of 13.5% in the North central area, 11.2% in the South, and 10.3% in the Northeast.

In the mid-1950s, there were 3,068 counties in the United States of which slightly over 57% were rural. Of 52,913 public school districts, one-half were rural. About 40% of the 130,473 public schools were classified as rural.[14] Of all the counties, 10.5% were reported to have public adult education; 1.5% had public summer schools; and 15 or 0.5% had a college or some form of post-high school training programs available.[15] In 1959, two-thirds of the adult education participants lived in an urban area, and in 1981, the percentage had risen to 68%. As the population becomes more urban, one would expect the percentage of urban participants in adult education programs to rise. But, it is in rural areas where there has typically been a paucity of opportunities. The largest percentage of participants in basic and secondary adult education programs were persons age 24 or less followed by those in the 25 to 44 age bracket, and the largest ethnic groups were White (45%) followed by Black (22.5%), and Hispanic (21.5%).

Agencies for Adult Education

Adult educational activities are provided by a number of different types of agencies. Between 1959 and 1981, there was a marked decline in adult education provided by elementary and secondary schools (22% to 7%) and group work agencies such as Red Cross, YMCA, etc. (14% to 8%). There was a significant increase in programs offered by two and four-year colleges (15% to 38%), and there was an increase in programs provided by employers or unions, including government (14% to 22%). As providers of adult education, there were decreases in programs offered by private and trade schools, agriculture extension, and libraries. Small increases were found among vocational/trade schools, employers/union, tutors, labor professional associations, and miscellaneous other providers.

Where adults obtain education is of interest. Shown in Table 2 are the percentages of adults in 1981 by type of agency from which they received adult education and support services. One fact which stands out is that, while colleges and universities constituted 38% of all agencies providing adult education as defined by the 1966 Act, only 4.3% of all adult education participants took advantage of programs provided by post-secondary level collegiate institutions.[16] Churches and business and industrial firms each served over three times as many adults as did collegiate institutions.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGES OF ADULT EDUCATION PARTICIPANTS BY AGENCY IN 50 STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Type of Agency	Percentage of Participants	Type of Agency	Percentage of Participants
Business & Industry	14.3	Vocational/Tech. Sch.	4.0
Labor Unions	0.8	Libraries	4.6
Community & Jr. Colleges	2.2	Institution for Handicapped	4.0
College & Universities	2.1	Correctional Institution	3.4
Hospitals	3.0	Local Educ. Agency	11.3
Churches	13.5	Anti-Poverty Program	3.5
Fraternal/Sacred	1.5	Other Public	5.4
Voluntary Community Org.	8.0	Other Private	1.4
Manpower/Training Agency	5.1	Other	8.1
Health Agency	3.8		

Factors Contributing to Increased Interest

A number of factors contributed to the phenomenal growth of interest by adults in educational programs and activities. Among the major factors were the snowball effects of the G.I. Bill, for thousands who took advantage of those opportunities not only desired continued opportunities for learning but also encouraged their children and grandchildren to pursue education. Another major factor has been the increasing accessibility of opportunities, both within the corporate world and in the public sector of education, primarily the community colleges, technical institutes, area vocational/technical schools, and Extension Service programs. Prior to the 1960s, the latter had focused attention on providing educational services solely related to agricultural and rural problems. During the 1960s decade, extension programs began to focus also upon problems of the urban poor and the development of community resources in urban areas.

The Library Service Act of 1956 brought library services to rural adults. Of special importance to the development of public adult education was the 1964 Library Services and Construction Act (amended in 1970), which provided funds for the delivery of library services to economically and socially disadvantaged, handicapped, homebound, and institutionalized adults.

Probably one of the most important factors has been the Federal response to the need for basic adult education through enactment and funding of the Adult Education Act in 1966 (P.L. 95-561). The precursor had been the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, which at first sought to remedy the inequalities of educational disadvantage for persons age 18 and over. A 1970 amendment lowered the age to 16. The act provided opportunity for eligible persons to develop reading, writing, language and arithmetic skills which would enable them to obtain and/or retain employment and to participate more fully as productive and responsible citizens. The Adult Education Act provided funds for adult basic and secondary level educational programs. Amendments in 1978 mandated that states conduct vigorous programs of outreach for those most in need of basic skill instruction and to provide such assistance as transportation, child care, and flexible schedules. Enrollments increased from nearly 38 thousand in 1965 to about 2 million in 1980, an increase of 5.2 thousand percent. Growth of the state administered programs of adult basic education can be illustrated by the amount of state allotments of Federal dollars. Allotments grew from 18.3 million in 1965 to 66.0 million in 1975 and to nearly 97 million in 1985. State and local agency matching is approximately 52% in the Continental United States and the District of Columbia. More recent data of comparable kind have not been published.

Implications for Summer Sessions

American population thirst for education as society moves toward the information and knowledge age has not gone altogether unnoticed by persons responsible for collegiate summer sessions. Some have attempted to attract adults into summer programs by scheduling night and week-end classes, the organization of short-term intensive courses geared to interests and needs of identifiable groups, and the offering of summer educational activities off-campus at convenient other locations for prospective students. It may be possible that this ever-growing interest of adults for continued life-long learning may represent a potential market for which only the surface has been scratched. Many two-year colleges host and offer professional upgrading in-service courses for technical and professional workers, and some four-year colleges and universities are doing likewise. Could it be that vacation time summer periods for many professionals and technical workers might be a time when appropriate summer educational programs would be enticing? Perhaps the initiative of summer session administrators and their staff will result in more summer programs geared to the large catchment of adults who apparently thirst in increasing numbers for additional relevant training and education.

Education for Teachers

It is because impetus was given to the development of collegiate summer sessions by teachers who could attend only in the summer period that the developments pertaining to the education of teachers is important. Various methods and provisions for teacher education prior to 1900 were discussed in Chapter 2. Many of the forces and influences which began after 1865 and particularly during the period 1890-1900 were to extend and to expand after the turn of the century. Some of the more important ones are discussed as they influenced the education of teachers and their school attendance during summers.

Factors Affecting the Need for Trained Teachers

Shortly after 1900, much concern was expressed in educational circles over the qualifications of teachers in the public schools.[17] In part, this concern may have been heightened by compulsory school attendance legislation, which had been enacted in some form by most state legislatures by 1900 and strengthened during the subsequent three decades, and the beginning development of child labor legislation on a wide scale. Mississippi was the last state to adopt a compulsory school attendance law in 1918. By 1924, all states but nine had some form of child labor legislation, and such laws in many of the states were so full of exceptions and lacking in comprehensiveness as to be virtually meaningless. Both types of legislation were evolving on quite an uneven basis among the states with nearly every stage of evolution present. The pertinence of these enactments is that they relegated to the schools an entirely new responsibility. They forced into the schools many students, including the truant and incorrigible, who formerly left early or were expelled, handicapped, children whose native language was other than English, and children from the broad socio-economic spectrum of the American population. Skills needed by teachers became considerably more complex to accommodate a heterogeneous student body and the public expectancy that all would receive a modicum of training essential to American citizenship. Teachers found it increasingly necessary to seek more education and training to cope with these changing conditions, and many did so during the summer time.

Added to the influence of compulsory education legislation were the effects of efforts to reform the organization of the educational system. In addition to recommendations of the Committee of Ten, the Committee of Fifteen, and the Committee on College Entrance Requirements mentioned in the previous chapter, the Committee on the Economy of Time appointed in 1911 furthered the emphasis in four reports issued between 1915 and 1919 on the need for reorganization of the curriculum and methods of teaching using scientific procedures. As reported by Baker, the Committee concluded that the period of general education should be shortened by at least two years. Such action committee members reasoned was supported by current demands of society, both practical and ideal.[18] Recommendations of this committee justified some of the structural reorganizations that had already begun. However, the Committee's major focus on conserving time was to rid the curriculums of obsolete materials and to push downward some of the instruction at higher levels.

Structural reorganizations resulted in new units, such as the junior college (1902) and the junior high school (1909-1910). These innovations required teachers with more specialized skills. The search for ways to better accommodate an increasingly heterogeneous student population, including the introduction of flexible grading and promotion plans, parallel courses of study, differentiated courses of study, classes, and schools, and new conceptions of education required more highly prepared teachers. So also did curricular reorganization experiments such as the Dalton Plan, the Winnetka Plan, the Gary Platoon Plan, as well as others. The infusion of new ideas about education from European sources, such as from Spencer, Pestalozzi, Froebel, Herbart, and Montessori and influences of such American educators as John Dewey, Francis Parker and others necessitated that persons preparing to teach develop skills for implementing teaching approaches based upon new ideas and philosophies.

Whereas, the teacher of the past was essentially a drill master and disciplinarian, the newer conceptions of teaching developed during the first three decades of this century, while retaining the former characteristics, included, in addition, the adapting and adjusting of school work to the needs and capacities of students. Individual as well as group results were called for, and teaching became a more difficult process and finer art. The school was transformed from only a disciplinary institution based on concepts of mental discipline into a social instrument designed to prepare young people for intelligent living in a democratic world increasingly becoming more complex. The demand for higher levels and modernized teacher inservice education heightened.

Quality of Teacher Education in the Early 1900s

By the turn of the 20th Century, city, county and state normal schools, and a few university departments of education had begun to replace teachers' institutes, teacher association meetings, and academies as sources of teacher education. After studying normal school entrance requirements in 50 normal schools scattered throughout the country during the 1895-1905 period, Gwinn reported entrance requirements.[19] In 1905, less than 8th grade graduation was required by four; 8th grade graduation was required by twenty-two; one year of high school work was required by ten; and, fourteen required high school graduation. Because of the lack of academic training required for entrance, normal schools in most instances gave high school level courses. Thirty-five of the fifty schools had not changed entrance requirements since 1895; of the 15 raising their standards, 9 had preparatory or sub-normal courses. Linscheid corroborated the secondary level of instruction in normal schools when he said: "Generally speaking and with allowances for only a few exceptions, the normal schools were institutions of a secondary level until 1900 and in some instances until 1910."[20] McNeil indicated that in 1910, the United States seemed to be in the midst of a transitional stage regarding the qualifications of entrants to normal schools. A few required high school graduation, and the tendency was pointing in that direction. A few normal schools required a pledge of future service; some required teaching experience; and, many required a certificate attesting good moral character. Most normal schools had a preparatory department which accommodated entrants with nearly any degree of academic standards.[21] By 1930, all 48 states required high school graduation or its equivalent for unconditional entrance to state normal schools and teachers colleges. Three states allowed certain teacher's certificates and the passing of a College Entrance Examination Board test for entrance in place of high school graduation. Some administered entrance examinations of their own for persons without a high school diploma. In 31 states, mature students over age 21 were allowed entrance for taking courses to work off entrance requirements if they had teaching experience.

Thorndike described the qualifications of secondary school teachers near the end of the first decade of the 1900s.[22] Of 100 men teachers in public high schools, 10 had less than four years of education beyond elementary school; 45 had 4 to 8 years beyond elementary school; 30 had 8 years; and, 15 had 9 years or more. Three-fifths had 6, 7, or 8 years of schooling above elementary school. Of the women, 6 to 7 had less than four years schooling beyond elementary school; 40 to 41 had 4 up to 8 years of schooling beyond elementary school; 41 to 42 had completed 8 years; and, 11 to 12 had 9 years or more. In private high schools, 7 to 8 of the men had less than four years beyond elementary school; 24 had from 4 to 8 years; 37 to 38 had completed 8 years; and, 31 had completed 9 years or more. Of 100 women teachers in private high schools, 14 to 15 had less than four years of education beyond high school; 46 had 4 to 8 years; 24 had 8 years; and, 15 to 16 had 9 years or more. Men teachers in secondary schools had more preparation for high school teaching than women. Larger percentages of teachers in private high schools than those in public schools had higher levels of education.

In 1911, there were 72 teachers institutes, normal institutes and teachers meetings planned within the 48 states. Summer normal schools established by law independently from colleges and normal schools operating 3 to 12 weeks instead of that many days had taken over the work of teachers institutes in at least 14 states. Summer sessions in state normal schools operated for 6 weeks in 17 states and summer sessions in college and university departments of education were displacing the institutes.[23] Properly managed teachers' institutes were found to have been valuable auxiliaries to the earlier normal schools wherever they existed and important substitutes where normal schools had not been established. In the first instance, institutes might last only for a day or two and be designed as inspirational experiences. In the second instance, institutes might extend 6 to 8 weeks and focus on a review of content to be taught and on teaching methods. Lack of recognition by school officials of the differences in types of institutes needed was a mistake in the management of them. Among the causes of failure or less than maximum success was the management of some institutes as money-seeking ventures or their use as platforms and occasions for personal display by hobby riders.

The plight of teacher preparation during the early part of the second decade of the 1900s in rural areas was highlighted by a 1913 report of the Bureau of Education.[24] The report indicated that, while educational conditions in villages of 1,000-2,500 population were fairly satisfactory when compared to city schools, the situation in the open country where schools were generally one-room schools was generally unsatisfactory and needed immediate attention. The magnitude of the problem can be discerned when it is recalled that in 1910, 58.5% of the population age 6-20 was rural, that of the total school enrollment, 62.3% was rural, and that 58.5% of the nation's average daily attendance was rural. A brief description of conditions in three states spotlight for the reader the plight of education in open country rural areas.[25]

Approximately 60% of the entire Kansas school population (5-21 years) lived in rural farm school districts in 1910. Of the 300,000 residents of rural districts, 87% were served by one-teacher, one-room schools in which the average enrollment was 22 and the term 26.3 weeks. Of the 7,873 one-room school teachers, only 25 (0.3%) were college graduates; 172 (2.2%) were normal school graduates, and 2,377 (30.0%) were high school graduates. Nearly one-half (46.7%) had no high school education, while slightly over one-fifth (20.8%) had attended but not graduated from high school. In the 2,213 two-teacher rural schools, conditions weren't much better; 4% were college graduates; 9% were normal school graduates; 35% were high school graduates; and, 35% had less than a high school education. Eight percent had finished one year of college, and another 9% had completed one year of normal school work. As late as 1941, with one year of college and a Kansas Three-Year State Certificate, the author of this chapter was one of three highest educated of 72 teachers in rural one-room schools in a Kansas county.

During 1910, 80.5% of the 13,116 Texas country school teachers had never attended college, normal school, or high school. Of those teachers, 1.3% had attended or were college graduates; 11.8% had attended or were high school graduates; and, 5.5% had attended or were normal school graduates. Of the 15,042 New York rural elementary teachers, less than one percent (0.9%) were college graduates; 21.8% were normal school graduates; and, another 40% had completed high school teacher training courses. In addition, only 36.9% were either high school graduates or had attended high school.

Teacher Certification and Licensure

Conditions described by Smart shortly prior to the turn of the century persisted for some time afterwards regarding the certification of teachers.[26] As effort mounted to supply numbers of teachers to staff the classrooms and to improve their qualifications so they could implement new developing concepts of education, concern increased about their qualifications. In referring to the return of less than the best from public expenditures for education, Smart alluded to the praiseworthy spirit and purpose held by a majority of teachers whose lack of trained ability to teach well was a weak point in schools throughout the land. School monies were derived in part from local tax levies, and from state appropriations. Laws in some states required that school be in session a given number of days before they were eligible for the state appropriated monies. Usually local authorities had only a small sum of money from which they had to pay a teacher to do the minimum required quantity of teaching at a compensation not exceeding the amount of local funds. Since the reward was small, the quality of work was almost always poor, or at best mediocre, for the salary level tempted mostly young women who wanted an addition to their scanty pocket money or young men who used the job as a stepping stone to continuing their own education. Teachers, often the most needy relative of a school trustee, could with little trouble procure a teaching certificate for a year or so by answering correctly a few questions on geography or making a few simple arithmetical calculations selected by an examiner or county superintendent or other similar official to whom was paid a fee for the labor of examining and issuing a certificate. In fact, an indifferent or unfaithful examiner could pocket the fee and issue the certificate without holding any examination. It was difficult under these circumstances to find competent instructors in rural schools. The better trained normal school graduates could get better pay and jobs in city school systems where the pace of urban growth had created a demand for teachers that exceeded the supply of trained persons available. So rural schools were stuck with employing someone of good character who could keep order but who had quite limited teaching power. Replacements due to turnover occasioned by women getting married and men leaving for other professions were recruits just out of school. The power to license, or certify, teachers was first vested in local authorities in nearly all the states. Early state and county authorities had neither the money nor staff to carry out such authority over any extended amount of territory.

As of fall term 1911, all states had provided for some form of license for teachers.[27] And as in the case of compulsory education and anti-child- labor legislation, the development was quite uneven among the states. Over two-thirds (68%) of the certificates were issued by central agencies such as state officers or educational institutions. Nearly one-fourth (24%) were granted by county boards or superintendents of education, and less than one-tenth (8%) were issued by local agencies such as school districts. Less than one-half the entire number of teachers held certificates issued by a state authority. Among the states the primary administrative systems established for issuance of teacher licenses were: state system--17 states; county system--1 state; state-county system--16 states; state-local system--6 states; and state-county-local systems--8 states.

A detailed history of the slow growth of teacher licensure during the 1800s and the gradual movement to centralize this responsibility in a state agency has been presented by Cook.[28] She presented information on trends in teacher certification for the years 1898, 1911, and 1919. The data revealed a trend toward state agency issued and regulated certificates, professional training as a basis for certification, and the inclusion of professional subjects in examinations for certification.[29] Both professional training and a high school education became a minimum prerequisite for the lowest grade certificates. By 1931, Frazier noted several trends in the professional education of teachers.[30] Foremost among them was the movement among states to raise certification standards by increasing the minimum requirements for mastery of academic, technical, and professional subject matter. Twelve states had raised requirements for beginning elementary teachers to two years above high school. Two had raised the minimum to three years, and California had established a minimum of four years. Nearly everywhere the bachelor's degree had become the standard minimum for teachers in accredited high schools with a tendency for a requirement of graduate work and a master's degree in the more progressive schools. Second, there was a trend toward certification in specific subjects or fields of work to replace blanket types of certification. Third, there was a definite movement to centralize certification responsibilities in State Departments of Education. While certificates were issued by about one-half of the states in 1920, in 1930 this was the case in three-fourths of the states. A fourth trend was for only institutions approved by the state education authority to grant certificates.

A comparison of numbers of teacher preparation institutions in 1919-20 and 1929-30 indicated also other significant trends. Numbers of teachers colleges and Departments of Education in colleges and universities had increased by 204 and 27 percents, respectively. On the other hand, declines in percentages of state normal schools, city normal schools, county normal schools, and private normal schools were 52, 21, 51 and 13 percentages, respectively. There had been a reduction from 325 normal schools to 191, a decline of 41%, whereas, the increase in numbers of teachers colleges and education departments of universities had been 42 percent.

A history of the emerging role and function of State Departments of Education in the general supervision of instruction in the schools and the expansion of staff to carry out this supervision has been detailed.[31] The addition of state-wide leadership concerned with the kind and quality of education provided and growth of state level inspections were added to the clerical, statistical, and business functions of the office by 1941. That year, Frazier studied the pre-service education of teachers in 319 institutions under state control. He found that of 1,709 institutions of higher education, 70% had been approved or recognized by state departments of education for teacher education and certification purposes.[32] In addition to the 319 institutions under state control, there were 100 city or school district controlled institutions (teachers college or normal school, university or 4-year college, or junior college) and 777 private and denominationally controlled institutions offering state approved preservice teacher preparation programs. With the advent of more centralized state-control over teacher licensure, teachers were forced to pursue their education, and increasing numbers did so during the summer.

By the mid-1980s, state supervision over the qualification of teachers for initial certification had manifest itself in the form of required competency assessment. Beginning with three states in 1977 the movement to assure a competent teaching force through competency testing spread rapidly. By 1984, 21 states had enacted legislation to require competency testing, and in that year 5 more state legislatures did so. Ten additional states planned to require competency testing of teachers by 1987.[33] The early impetus to assess teacher competency began in Louisiana, North Carolina, Georgia, Arkansas, South Carolina, Florida, and Tennessee. The decline in pupil achievement as revealed by Scholastic Aptitude Test scores and the rank of student knowledge of mathematics and science at the median compared to scores in 20 countries stimulated deep public concern. In response to public opinion that some part of the decline in student performance below expectations could be attributed to teaching and teachers, legislatures and state departments of education have sought to assure teacher competency through testing for admission to a teacher education program and/or prior to certification. Tests typically covered basic skills, professional and pedagogical skills, and academic knowledge. In addition, there was a movement in increasing numbers of states to require an internship or beginning teacher year during which individuals were carefully evaluated before initial certification.[34]

Collective Bargaining and Negotiation

During the first half of the 1900s, out of the continuing and accelerated industrial revolution begun the latter part of the previous century, there emerged strong labor unions. These unions came to exert considerable national influence in the improvement of rewards and working conditions for workers. It was no surprise to many that teachers, caught up in bureaucratic social structures of schools and unable to better their lot, would seek more highly formalized systems of communication. Teaching had always been a low-salaried occupation marked by entrance and retention standards low enough to permit a significant percentage of the total group to enter and exit the profession at sporadic intervals. There was insufficient control within the profession to restrict the unqualified from filling positions in either real or pseudo-emergencies. Teaching had a relatively poor image as a career field as viewed by the American public, particularly for males. It came as little surprise to many that in an effort to professionalize the work and bring about changed and improved working conditions, particularly having an appropriate voice in the determination of school policies affecting their work and welfare, teacher groups would turn to the methods of collective bargaining and negotiation. The tenor of the times was captured when a major national newspaper reported, "A resurgence of militancy among the nation's public school teachers marked the year 1963. There was mounting evidence that teachers are no longer content to rule only the classroom to which they are assigned . . . they want their views heard and heeded."[35] After analyzing the situation, Steffensen emphasized the point that the desirability of changes in teacher association-board relationships or lack of it should be based on implications for schools. He also emphasized the importance of the goal to be sought by the establishment of collective bargaining and negotiation procedures and their effect upon American education.[36]

During the 1960s, the National Education Association (NEA) changed its organizational agenda from being a professional organization that had condemned collective bargaining, strikes, and affiliation with the labor movement to embracing all objectives for which the labor unions stood. This action was prompted by challenges from the American Federation of Teachers, particularly after their victory of winning over New York City teachers and teachers in other major cities, and from challenges from its own urban membership located largely in medium-size cities and suburbs. Urban associations exerted political clout within the National Education Association, operating as a bloc through the National Council of Urban Education created for the purpose of political action. The organization (NEA) was successfully transformed into an advocacy organization for classroom teachers by 1971, and conflicts of interest between teachers and administrators were emphasized instead of professional unity and cooperation. The previous stance that it could be unprofessional to get involved in partisan politics gave way to political action as a strategy with heavy involvement in partisan electoral politics. The activities of organized teachers contributed greatly to the politicization of educational policy and altered the kinds of policies that were enacted by all levels of government from the local Board of Education to the Federal Government.

During the 1970s, the NEA infringed upon the traditional prerogatives of collegiate schools/colleges/departments of education in the setting of standards for teacher preparation and accreditation. This was part of an effort to achieve greater status for the classroom teacher. The NEA adopted the concept that a profession is self-regulating and advocated full participation of teachers in the establishment of professional standards. Organized teachers have sought to guarantee teacher participation in decisions regarding the content of teacher preparation programs and standards for accreditation.

A significant impact on summer session offerings has been the goal of organized teachers to transform control over teacher in-service training from the exclusive jurisdiction of higher education institutions to collaborative efforts involving teacher organizations and local school districts. Weaknesses of traditional professional development programs cited by teachers were that courses offered by schools of education were designed to move teachers out of the classroom by preparing them for positions as counselors, librarians, and administrators. Another argument was that job-related training should include operational components designed to improve relevant classroom skills by emphasizing on-site or in-classroom observation and follow-up as well as informational components such as workshops, courses, and conferences typically provided by colleges of education. Teacher disenchantment with the way such activities were usually structured led organized teachers to demand that they be given more influence over the design and management of in-service activities. They wanted more field-based training geared to needs and program formats that were jointly determined by the teachers' organization, Local Education Association (LEA), and schools of education. During the mid-1970s, through successful lobbying efforts by teachers organizations, Congress established federal Teacher Centers for the in-servicing of classroom teachers and the formulation of new curricula. Rather than being managed by schools of education, these centers were run as project grants to local school districts and operated under the supervision of a policy board, the majority of whom were classroom teachers. In some cases, these centers were run by colleges and universities under contract to local districts, but control over policy was placed in the hands of classroom teachers.[37]

A number of teacher organizations at the local level made professional development items part of the collective bargaining package, including the introduction of new in-service programs conducted by the teachers' organization itself. Both the NEA and American Federation of Teachers (AFT) were strongly committed to improving the status of teachers, and wage gains resulted. With the onset of enrollment declines and decreased financial resources of the late 1970s and early 1980s, teachers' organizations substituted greater teacher control over educational policy matters for the wage gains achieved previously. Basic to this objective was the belief of teachers and those who represented them that they should have autonomy in the classroom and a strong voice in how the learning process was structured. Unless schools of education are willing to reorient their focus and enter into effective partnership relationships with organized teachers, they have lost their preeminent position as providers of teacher in-service education, much of which for three-quarters of a century was offered during the summer sessions.

Teacher Preparation and Qualifications in the 1980s

By the 1980s, the commonly accepted model for teacher education programs was four years of college culminating in the bachelor's degree. Due to various social and demographic changes which had developed, recurring questions surfaced about whether initial certification of teachers represented a sufficient stage of professional competence. While the four-year baccalaureate degree model of teacher education had remained fairly constant for about 50 years, schools had been forced to accept new roles with attendant increased and different responsibilities for teachers. Society grew in complexity, school populations changed markedly, and due to federal and philanthropic support for educational research during the 1970s, there was a rapid expansion of the professional knowledge base. Schools must accommodate needs of the handicapped, assume additional in locus parentis responsibilities to accommodate increases in incidence of single parent and two-breadwinner families, and deal skillfully and effectively with students from diverse cultural, multicultural, multilingual and economic backgrounds. The widely publicized declines in student performance, particularly in basic skill competence precipitated public attention to the quality of instruction and to the effectiveness of teacher preparation. At the same time, schools were being deluged with pressures to give added attention to an ever broader array of social concerns such as economic education, health and substance abuse education, parent education, and environmental education to name a few. In view of the criticisms, government mandates, and persuasive recommendations of lay, professional, and government groups, institutions preparing teachers have been required to modify programs, and that action has generally been an addition to the program. Some leaders in the profession sense, that in contrast to the early 1960s when impending demographic conditions were different, the time may be right now for the exercise of leadership to alter the traditional model of teacher education by extending preparation programs. Seven alternative models, each requiring five or more years of college work (including an internship or additional year of professional studies and practicum) were described by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.[38] The association encouraged the development of major structural changes in teacher preparation programs related to initial certification, a redesign of general education, renovation of academic specialization, greater depth of study in the professional culture, and more extensive development of teaching competencies. The call for teacher preparation program extension was for the purpose of more fully integrating theory and practice through expanded clinical and field experiences and to permit professional study commensurate with the expanded knowledge base available from research.

A review of percentages of all public elementary and secondary school teachers by highest degree earned for the period 1961 to 1983 revealed that during the 1970s, there was a marked decline in the percentage of teachers with less than a bachelor's degree (14.6% to 0.4%). Teachers with only bachelor's degrees declined from 69.6% in 1966 and 1971 to 47.6% in 1983. The increase in percentage of teachers with master's degrees or 6 years of college rose significantly during the late 1970s and early 1980s (23% in 1961 to 51.9% in 1983). Teachers with doctor's degrees remained at a fairly stable percent age level (0.4%), probably because many of these teachers became administrators or college professors and thus left the classrooms. Over two-thirds of all public school teachers in 1983 had 10 years or more experience; the average years of experience was 15 years. Only 3% had two or fewer years' experience. The median age in 1983 for teachers was 39 years.[39] One could characterize the teaching force in the mid-1980s as mature. Since such a high percentage of the teaching force had completed a masters degree or more education, demand for summer courses diminished. With the projected increase in school enrollments during the late 1980s and early 1990s, at a time when a mature teaching force approaches retirement, there may be opportunity for summer sessions to flourish.

After about one-half dozen highly critical reports by national organizations and groups had called public attention to inadequacies in the schools, by the mid-1980s the winds of change and reform in teacher education blew strong. Critics cited the failure of schools of education to infuse into teacher preparation curricula knowledge produced by a great deal of research on the skills teachers need to be effective. Some believed teacher education had failed to recognize greater pupil diversity, the infusion of social problems into the schools, and broadened public expectations regarding public education. Alternatives to the lecture-based teaching method were not effectively taught, and many failed to train teachers in the new educational technologies or to provide enough field experience with strong evaluations and feedback. Too often poor relationships existed between education schools and arts and sciences departments resulting in inadequate preparation in both subject content areas and pedagogy. Teacher preparation programs were typically poorly coordinated with either the public schools or state and local education agencies and teachers associations.[40]

National surveys in the mid-1980s revealed that high percentages of teacher education institutions had made some form of curriculum revision and adopted higher admission, retention, and graduation standards. Some institutions began to use research findings to improve their teacher education programs, to recognize the need for teaching teachers how to use computers, and to enhance the field-based component as well as to extend programs to accommodate longer periods of student teaching. In the late 1980s various experiments were underway to develop school-college and state partnerships and to develop collaborative and innovative approaches to in-service training. Although these were serious problems with the validity and discriminatory effects of competency tests, unqualified candidates were being weeded out, but tests probably do little to attract qualified persons to the profession, thus the impending teacher shortage may be exacerbated by such actions. It may be that, if there is success in recruiting students and community residents from non-education fields, the identification of their pedagogical needs and development of programs to train them would become part of the summer session function for the future.

In early August 1986, a group of 88 deans of education from around the country known as the Holmes Group, met at one of Frank Lloyd Wright's prairie homes in Wisconsin to discuss the future of teacher preparation.[41] Early in 1987, a plan was submitted based on several themes. Themes were to develop a post-master's degree program for the career teacher, to redesign teacher preparation programs to address basic issues involving the quality and quantity of courses needed by future teachers, and to work with educational agencies and professional organizations to improve the quality of work life in American schools. Other themes were to work with practitioners in the field by choosing target schools with which to develop an on-going professional relationship for enhancing the preparation and continuing education of teachers, and to support an excellent undergraduate liberal arts education. The work of this and perhaps other similar groups could have a profound influence on the shape and direction of teacher education over the next quarter of a century.

Growth of Summer Sessions

At the turn of the century, the summer school idea in theory and practice was no longer a new factor in the educational system. Considerable variety existed in offerings, methods of instruction, and organization. The summer period was an open field for experimentation as evidenced by several categories of schools extant. Some gave instruction in single subjects; some were schools for original scientific investigation for the training of specialists, particularly in the natural sciences; and, others provided instruction in several branches of knowledge. The education of teachers was a dominant purpose of most summer schools organized during the 1800s. Other purposes were to enable regular students to accelerate their programs or to make up deficiencies and to provide instruction to other persons who could not attend school during the winter. In this section, the development of summer sessions since 1900 is sketched.

Trends in Summer Session Growth to 1920

For the years 1907-08 to 1920-21, statistics were compiled by the Bureau of Education from state higher education institutions regarding enrollments during regular and summer terms.[42] Data from the years 1907, 1912, 1916, and 1920 reveal trends in numbers of institutions and in summer term enrollments. In 1907, 35 out of 82 state supported colleges and universities reported summer term enrollments. When reported summer enrollments for those same institutions were observed for the years 1912, 1916, and 1920, percentages of increase were 15.4, 0.6, and 98.7, respectively. The effect of World War I can be seen reflected in the low percentage increase in 1916. For those same years the increases in numbers of state-aided institutions reporting summer sessions were 48.6, 2.3, and 6.7 percentages, respectively, and the increases of total summer term enrollments in all state-aided institutions were 73.5, 26.2, and 51.9 percentages, respectively. In 1907, summer term enrollments represented 26.8% of the regular fall term enrollments or a ratio of 1 to 3.7, but by 1920, the ratio was 1 to 3.4.

An enrollment report by Egbert for 27 universities from which administrative officers of summer schools met at the University of Michigan reveals enrollment change between 1916 and 1921 in large universities.[43] Although there was a decrement of 16.5% between 1916 and 1917 due to World War I, the increase between 1916 and 1921 was 50.6 percent. This percentage growth in large universities during the approximate time period was comparable to the percentage growth experienced by 95 state-aided colleges and universities reporting to the Bureau of Education.

It wasn't until 1911 that the U.S. Office of Education began to report in a periodic and organized manner statistics on summer schools in all types of institutions. In that year, 477 of more than 500 summer schools provided information. Of those institutions, 38% granted degree credits, and a total of 118,307 students were reported enrolled in summer sessions.[44] By 1916, the number of all institutions reporting summer schools had increased by 54% to 734 institutions, and enrollments had increased by 152% to 298,219 students. Numbers of faculty members teaching in summer sessions increased by 119 percent.[45] The percentage of institutions offering degree credits had risen to 40 percent. For the 1916-1918 biennial survey, 231 schools considered to be non-academic were eliminated from the statistical data gathering for 1918, and 480 academic summer schools were reported to be enrolling 160,422 students. Eliminated from the count had been summer Y.M.C.A. schools, summer camps, schools for the purpose of preparing persons for teacher certification, city summer schools, and summer schools for teachers of the deaf, blind, or feeble minded. It is from 1918 that comparable data reveal trends limited to colleges and universities, normal schools, and other collegiate degree rank professional schools. In 1918, summer schools were operating in 104 universities, 119 colleges, 135 normal schools, and 122 other schools, primarily professional.

Growth of Summer Sessions 1920-1960

Throughout the 1920s, summer programs continued to expand. Due to nationwide increases in educational requirements for teacher certification which accompanied the transfer of authority and responsibility for licensing teachers from local to state level offices in the 1920s, a large influx of teachers to summer sessions was a consequence.

Between 1921 and 1931, there was an 88% increase in summer session enrollments, and the numbers of institutions offering summer sessions increased to 707, including 108 junior colleges.[46] In 1931, 48%, or 707 of 1,460 higher education institutions offered summer sessions, but in 1933, 50.4%, or 715, of 1,418 institutions did so. This represented during the height of the economic depression days both a percentage and an absolute increase in summer sessions. Among those 715 institutions were 454 colleges and universities (63%), 137 teachers colleges (19%), 27 normal schools (4%), and 97 junior colleges (14%).[47]

Although summer enrollments dropped briefly in 1933 at the height of the economic depression, they had rebounded to an all time high of 429,864 in 869 institutions by 1937. In 1937, summer session enrollments were first classified by institutional control, and 61% were found in public institutions. Summer enrollment increases during the 1930s were partly the result of an over supply of teachers, keen competition for jobs, and desire of teachers to improve their competitive advantage by summer school work with school boards interested in purchasing as much training as they could get for the salaries proffered. In 1937, summer sessions were offered in 566 universities, colleges, and professional schools (65%), 142 teachers colleges (16%), 127 junior colleges (15%), and 34 normal schools (4%).[48] In that year, the U.S. Office of Education staff noted a numerical relationship between summer and regular session headcount enrollments. Summer session enrollments in teacher training institutions were more than 75% as large as those in regular session, while they were about 25% as large in degree-granting universities, colleges, and professional schools as a group. Summer enrollments in junior colleges were miniscule.

Following a decline in summer enrollments of about 6.5% between 1939 and 1941, by 1945 enrollments had risen to 515,602, an increase of about 20% above the 1937 summer enrollments. The war period increase after 1941 was primarily due to campus based military programs designed to accelerate student progress.[49] Between 1945 and 1947, summer session enrollments increased 85.3 percent. Much of this increase was accounted for by military veterans wishing to accelerate programs for degree completion under the educational provisions of the Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act. Then between 1947 and 1955, there was another 10% increase when 1,047,068 students attended summer sessions in 1,100 institutions.[50]

Status of Summer Sessions in 1960

The first nationwide comprehensive study of collegiate summer sessions was conducted slightly over 29 years ago.[51] Results provide comparative baseline information against which change during the rest of this century can be determined.

In 1960, 19.4% of the 1,221 institutions reporting summer terms were two-year colleges; 11.4% were universities; 14.3% were teachers colleges; 44.1% were liberal arts colleges; and 10.8% were other types of four-year schools. The largest percentages of all institutions, regardless of the type, with summer sessions were geographically located in the Southeastern states (23.1%) followed by the Mideastern (18.0%) and Great Lakes states (16.4%). Of all summer sessions, others were located in the Plains states (12.1%), Far West (12.0%), Southwest (8.7%), New England (7.1%), and Rocky Mountains (2.5%).[52]

About 15% of the universities estimated that over one-half the summer session enrollments were of teachers compared to 58% of the liberal arts colleges and 93% of the teachers colleges. It was in this period that many college and university administrators began evaluating with renewed interest the expansion of summer session as a possible means of accommodating rapidly increasing enrollments at a rate greater than at which facilities could be expanded. Collegiate institutions providing summer sessions in 1960 constituted two-thirds of all higher education institutions.

Approximately 3 out of every ten institutions with summer sessions expected to expand them some way.

It was at this juncture in time that Schoenfeld declared that the summer session had come of age.[53] He claimed after reviewing 75 years of evolution, the university summer session had emerged as a teaching pattern of significant stature and utility. He stated that, "across the country academicians and politicians alike look to the optimum utilization of campus skills and resources around the calendar in order to teach economically more undergraduates and adults than ever before in history."[54] He optimistically saw no cloud ahead to obscure the summer sun in an era where teachers were hieing back to college every summer due to salary schedules tied to summer school academic progress and federal income tax policies that made deductible expenses for professional advancement. Besides problems of staffing in competition with opportunities staff had to engage in lucrative government and industrial research projects, he foresaw a challenge to preserve flexibility of the summer session in the face of increasing pressures to convert it into a standard summer semester. In large measure, these mounting pressures emanated from the impending numbers of students who were about to besiege college gates.

Summer Sessions Since 1960

A study at the end of the 1960s by the College Management staff reflected some of the characteristics by that time.[55] Although inquiries had been mailed to 2,882 collegiate institutions, information was provided by 37 percent. Two-thirds had offered summer sessions in 1965, but by 1968 over three-fourths (78%) had offered summer sessions. Nearly one-fifth of the respondents indicated the summer session had been integrated into their regular year-around curriculum, and more anticipated taking this step. Of all summer course offerings, 84% were for credit, and most students enrolled for 6 to 12 credits. A marked growth was evidenced between 1965 and 1968 in two-year college summer enrollments. A prediction was made that by 1974 there would be a collegiate summer session enrollment of 2.4 million.

Almost all of the 1,073 institutions responding rated summer courses equivalent to courses of the same name offered during other terms in the year, and most carried the same credits. Significant was the finding that in- service teacher education had become no longer a primary function.

By 1977, the earlier optimism had waned as concerned observers wondered if the days were dwindling down for college summer sessions.[56] A number of summer session directors felt the historical independence and innovative character of summer sessions were being threatened by the erosion of enrollments. Fewer public-school teachers were returning to college in summer and regular college students, discouraged about employment prospects or forced by rising costs to take summer jobs, had less incentive to accelerate through summer study their progress toward a degree. The expansion and intrusion of continuing education activities throughout the year into the realm of short courses, new instructional techniques, special programs for identifiable groups, interdisciplinary approaches, institutes, and the like, once the primary, if not the exclusive, domain of summertime session, had made the summer session no longer unique in its efforts along these lines of endeavor. Seen also as a threat to the collegiate summer session was the growing tendency to combine administratively the summer session with such other activities as the evening division, nontraditional programs such as study abroad, extension, and continuing education. The amalgamation of responsibility for summer session activities with these several other types of activities tended to blur the distinction between programs, and some summer session partisans feared the likelihood would be increased that summer session might be absorbed and lose its identity.

Summer session leaders were uneasy about protecting the academic quality of programs in the face of growing pressures from institutional administrators to bring in new students. The pressure to be competitive even if it required an easing of standards and to make programs self-supporting, if not profit making, ran counter to the desires of many summer session directors sensitive about the reputation of their programs. This sensitivity, akin to an inferiority complex, was in part fed historically by a long-standing belief that summer term was a recreational escape from the rigors of true scholarship and not fully accepted in academic circles.

In 1976, 80% (2,544) of all collegiate institutions had summer sessions. Nearly 60% were four-year institutions, and more than one-half were public. By the 1980-81 year, summer sessions were reported offered in 2,795 or 85.5% of all institutions of higher education; others reported they did not offer a summer session. Summer sessions were held in 94.5 and 76.6 percents, respectively, of the public and private four-year institutions. Of the two-year colleges, 96.8 and 76.2 percentages, respectively, of the public and private institutions reported summer sessions. Of all public and private four-year and two-year colleges, 96 and 76.5 percentages, respectively, had summer sessions. In that year, 916 institutions with summer sessions offered post-baccalaureate degree programs; they constituted 75 and 36 percentages, respectively, of the public and private institutions reporting summer sessions.[57]

As the decade of the 1980s began, the numbers of two and four-year institutions offering summer sessions had increased to an all-time high in numbers and in percentages. Larger percentages of public than private collegiate institutions continued to offer summer sessions. In

1980, 42% of the 2,795 institutions reporting summer sessions were two-year colleges. The percentage of all summer sessions found in two-year colleges had more than doubled during two decades. This trend was not unexpected as the numbers of two-year colleges nearly doubled during this period, and some of the same reasons for summer attendance were present for their clientele as for students in four-year colleges. The claim that summer session had come of age two decades ago and that the future looked bright for further growth and expansion had been borne out.

Summer Session Prospects

In retrospect, from their sporadic and feeble beginnings during the latter part of the 1800s, summer sessions had by the turn of the century become officially incorporated as part of the operating budget and legitimized as a function in a number of major collegiate institutions. The idea and practice grew, and enhanced by war-time demands and support, they flourished mightily during the 1920s. After nearly becoming casualties in many institutions during the height of the depression years, by the late 1930s and 1940s summer sessions rebounded to new heights in both numbers and enrollments. Encouraged by the federal government and the placement of military training programs on campuses during the World War II era, summer sessions thrived as full-length summer semesters and quarters on many campuses. During the 1950s, as the bulge in enrollment of veterans subsided, there was renewed emphasis on expanding and re-establishing a variety of offerings to attract new potential student markets. The general collegiate enrollment boom of the late 1950s which continued into the early 1970s was accompanied by flourishing summer sessions as one approach to accommodating the increased hordes of students desiring a college education. Until the 1970s, an important and major enrollment component had been teachers who returned to school in the summer to complete work toward credential updating or qualification for higher level credentials. As the 1970s drew to a close, teacher enrollments that historically had been the engine behind the evolution of summer sessions had begun to partake of increasing numbers of in-service activities and opportunities sponsored by professional associations and unions throughout the regular year. The professional development activities outside the college campus replaced in large measure the earlier practice of going to summer school. Remedial programs, once a substantial part of summer sessions, had virtually disappeared by 1980.

As the 1980s began, at least two effects of the changing potential enrollment catchment were apparent. In some institutions, regular degree program students from other terms during the year began to constitute a high percentage of summer enrollments. In other institutions, there was a proliferation of non-credit activities and experimentation with different delivery formats (e.g., mini-course series, intensive immersion programs, etc.) and schedules (e.g., weekend, evening, concentrated selected week days, etc.). In yet other institutions, both types of events were evident.

Summer session enrollments have reflected and been affected by the trends of the times which have affected higher education as a whole. Future summer session enrollments may again be affected by an influx of teachers if colleges and universities find ways to work effectively as partners with those professional associations and agencies that have virtually taken over responsibility for teacher in-service activities. The movement to raise standards for initial teacher certification beyond a four-year bachelor's degree to a fifth-year and/or master's degree level will have its continuing influence on the decline of teachers needing to pursue graduate work during summer. Some predict that by the year 1995, when another major increase in elementary and secondary school pupils is expected, the current movement to raise standards and limit entrance to teacher education programs will result in the teacher certification of thousands of untrained but college educated persons just to staff classrooms. In this eventuality, summer sessions may find the need to service such personnel.

Another set of factors impinging on summer sessions in the early 1980s was the high rate of inflation and accompanying rise in costs. Over the short-term, summer session enrollments in many institutions may have temporarily increased as regular degree students accelerate programs to beat the rise in tuition and other costs of college attendance.[58] As the numbers of persons of college age declines and competition for students increases, such competition is likely to reduce enrollments during summer in some institutions. With the high percentage of institutions offering summer programs in the 1980s, students are finding courses they want at institutions closer to home, thus reducing the percentages of visiting summer students on some campuses.

Between 1983 and 1994, there is expected to be a decline in the number of persons age 18. Between 1983 and 1990, total college enrollments have been projected to decline by 2%, and between 1982 and 1992, the decrease is expected to approximate 5 percent. Percentages of full-time college students are expected to decline from 57.1 to 53.1 percent. Percentages of undergraduates are expected to decline by 1.2 percent. The percentage of males is expected to decrease by 0.7% to 48.4 percent. Percentages of students under age 25 are expected to decrease from 59.4% in 1983 to 51.3% in 1990. Enrollments of all higher education students in public institutions is expected to increase slightly by 0.4 percent.[59] According to Arbeiter, there will be a marked shift in demand for college graduates as competition increases for high school graduates by the military services, business, and industry.[60] Of 19 million new jobs created between 1980 and 1990, only 18% are expected to be professional or technical. However, about 37% will be low wage and clerical positions. The changing industrial and occupational structure of the labor force will undoubtedly impact the future percentages of youth who seek college education immediately after high school graduation, thus impacting further the nature of undergraduate enrollments in American higher education.

The expected changing characteristics of higher education as projected into the 1990s will undoubtedly affect summer session enrollments. The most immediate effect expected might be a trend toward declining enrollments of regular college students trying to accelerate programs.

Summary of Educational Growth/Expansion

Significant changes in population size and composition were traced. Trends portend significantly higher percentages of college age non-white and persons over age 65 and a decreasing proportion of women. Expansions in the elementary-secondary and higher education segments of formal education were traced, and a significant trend has been the increase in proportion of collegiate undergraduate enrollments found in two-year colleges. The expanded role of adult education, factors precipitating heightened interest in it, and agencies providing such opportunities were discussed. And implications for collegiate summer sessions were identified.

The evolutionary struggle for adequately prepared teachers, once the mainstay of collegiate summer session enrollments, was detailed. The impact of collective bargaining and the state supervised competency assessment movements have had a profound effect on the nature of summer enrollments. They have transformed control over teacher in-service training and wrested it from the exclusive jurisdiction of collegiate institutions. The structural growth of summer sessions during this century to the early 1980s, when the numbers of institutions offering summer sessions reached an all time high was discussed. The emerging growth of summer sessions among two-year colleges was noted. Trends which portend a possible decline in summer enrollments of other term degree program students were cited among the future prospects.

Chapter 3 -- Endnotes

1. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1986), 33.

2. Ibid., 68.

3. American Council on Higher Education, 1984-85 Fact Book on Higher Education (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1984), 1.

4. Ibid., 4.

5. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970, Part 1, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975), 368, 379, 382-3; National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics for 1983-84 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office), 101, 110; National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics for 1989 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office), 9, 12, 98, 103, 173.

6. U.S. Bureau of Education, Public and Private High Schools, Bulletin No. 22 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1912), 6-7.

7. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1986, 126.

8. National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics, 1983-84, 101; Digest for Education Statistics, 1989, 9, 12.

9. National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics, 1981-82 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1981), XXIV.

10. National Center for Education Statistics, Projections of Education Statistics to 1992-93 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), 45-48; Digest of Education Statistics, 1989, 172.

11. American Council on Higher Education, 1984-85 Fact Book on Higher Education, 57.

12. U.S. Office of Education, Participation in Adult Education, Circular No. 539 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959), 1-37.

13. National Center for Education Statistics, The Condition of Education, 1984 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1984), 156- 171.

14. U.S. Office of Education, Statistics of Rural Schools: A U.S. Summary, Circular No. 565 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959), 3.

15. Ibid., 15.

16. National Advisory Council on Adult Education, Opening Doors for Success, FY-1983 Annual Report to the President of the United States (Washington, D.C.: The Council, 1984), 24-5; 34-44.

17. Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934), Chapters 13-17.

18. U.S. Bureau of Education, Economy of Time in Education, by George Baker, Bulletin No. 38, 1913 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1913), 18.

19. Joseph M. Gwinn, "Tendencies in the Entrance Requirements of State Normal Schools," Education 28 (December 1907): 233-37.

20. American Association of Teachers Colleges, A. Linscheid, ed., Yearbook of the American Association of Teachers Colleges (New York: The Association, 1928), 31.

21. Mellicent McNeil, A Comparative Study of Entrance to Teacher-Training Institutions, Ph.D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions to Education, No. 443 (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1930), 58.

22. U.S. Bureau of Education, The Teaching Staff of Secondary Schools in the United States, by Edward L. Thorndike, Bulletin No. 4 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1909), 15; 19.

23. U.S. Bureau of Education, "Teachers Institutes," Agencies for the Improvement of Teachers in Service, by William C. Ruediger, Bulletin No. 3 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1911), 157.

24. U.S. Bureau of Education, The Status of Rural Education in the United States, by A. C. Monahan, Bulletin No. 8 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1913), 12-13; 16.

25. Ibid., 37-39.

26. U.S. Bureau of Education, Teachers Institutes, by James H. Smart, Circular of Information, No. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1885), 5-11.

27. U.S. Bureau of Education, Teachers Certificates Issued Under General State Laws and Regulations, by Harlan Updegraff, Bulletin No. 18 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1911), 136-39.

28. U.S. Bureau of Education, State Laws and Regulations Governing Teachers' Certificates, by Katherine M. Cook, Bulletin No. 22 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921), 6-13.

29. Ibid., 9; 13.

30. U.S. Office of Education, "Professional Education of Teachers," Biennial Survey of Education 1928-1930, by Benjamin W. Frazier, Bulletin No. 20, 1931 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932), 510-14.

31. U.S. Office of Education, Supervision of Instruction as a Function of State Departments of Education, by Katherine M. Cook, Bulletin No. 6, 1940, Monograph No. 7 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941), 1-165.

32. U.S. Office of Education, Education of Teachers as a Function of State Departments of Education, by Benjamin W. Frazier, Bulletin No. 6, Monograph No. 6, 1940 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941), 3.

33. National Center for Education Statistics, The Condition of Education 1985 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), 162.

34. J. T. Sandefur, "Competency Assessment of Teachers," Action in Teacher Education 7 (Spring-Summer 1985):1-36.

35. New York Times, 16 January 1964, 88.

36. U.S. Office of Education, Teachers Negotiate with Their School Boards, by James P. Steffensen, Bulletin No. 40 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964), 58-9.

37. Lorraine M. McDonnell, "NEA Priorities and Their Impact on Teacher Education," AACTE Yearbook 1977 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977), 61-67.

38. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Educating a Profession: Extended Programs for Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1983), 7-19.

39. National Center for Education Statistics, The Condition of Education, 1985, 139, 154.

40. Erica Gosman, ed., Quality in Teacher Education: A Crisis Revisited (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1985), 1-13; 17-40.

41. Carl Berger, "The Holmes Group Meets at Wingspread," The University of Michigan School of Education Innovater 18 (September 1986):2.

42. U.S. Bureau of Education, Statistics of State Universities and Other Institutions of Higher Education Partially Supported by the State, Bulletin No. 8, 1908, 4-7; Bulletin No. 60, 1913, 14-17; and U.S. Bureau of Education, Statistics of State Universities and State Colleges, Bulletin No. 55, 1917, 10-12; Bulletin No. 53, 1921, 6-9 (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1909, 1914, 1918, 1922).

43. U.S. Bureau of Edcucation, University Summer Schools, by James C. Egbert, Bulletin No. 31, 1922 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1922), 6-7.

44. U.S. Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year Ended June 30, 1911, Volume II, Chapter 30 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1912), 1129-1182.

45. U.S. Bureau of Education, Biennial Survey of Education, 1916-1918, Volume IV, Chapter 5, Bulletin No. 91, 1919 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921), 509-510.

46. U.S. Office of Education, Statistics of Higher Education, 1931-32, Biennial Survey of Education 1930-22, Chapter 3, Bulletin No. 2, 1933 (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1935), 123-193.

47. U.S. Office of Education, Statistics of Higher Education, 1933-34, Biennial Survey of Education: 1932-34, Chapter IV, 120-199; U.S. Office of Education, Statistical Summary of Education, 1937-38, Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, Volume 2, Chapter I, Bulletin No. 2, 1940, 29; Statistics of Higher Education, 1937-38, Chapter IV, 151; 132-179 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1937, 1941, and 1941).

48. U.S. Office of Education, Statistical Summary of Education 1935-36, Biennial Survey of Education 1934-36, Volume 2, Chapter 1, Bulletin No. 2, 1937 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1939), 14-17; U.S. Office of Education, Statistics of Higher Education 1937-38, Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, Chapter IV (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941), 15; 132-78.

49. U.S. Office of Education, Statistical Summary of Education 1948-50, Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1948-50, Chapter I (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953), 38.

50. U.S. Office of Education, Statistics of Higher Education, 1955-56, Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1954-56, Chapter IV, Section I (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959), 130.

51. U.S. Office of Education, Summer Sessions in Colleges and Universities in the United States 1960, by Donald F. Warner, Bernice R. Retzlaff, and Harold A. Haswell. Circular No. 700. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963), ERIC, ED 048 841.

52. Ibid., 11-12.

53. Clarence A. Schoenfeld, "The Summer Session Comes of Age," School and Society 89 (Summer 1961):268-70.

54. Ibid., 268.

55. "What's Happening to Summer School?" College Management 4 (January 1969):9-15.

56. Robert L. Jacobson, "Are the Days Dwindling Down for College Summer Sessions?" The Chronicle of Higher Education 15 (12 September 1977):3-4.

57. National Center for Education Statistics, 3,270 Postsecondary Institutions Accredited in 1980-81 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1981), 4, ERIC, ED 207 425.

58. Jack Magarrell, "Not all Summer-Session Rolls Go Up with Temperature," The Chronicle of Higher Education 22 (6 July 1981):5.

59. National Center for Education Statistics, The Condition of Education, 1984, 70-71 and 1985, 98; 102; National Center for Education Statistics, Projections of Education Statistics to 1992-93, 49-56.

60. Soloman Arbeiter, "Guns, Butter, or Sheepskins," The College Board Review, No. 137, 1985, 16-21; 30-33.

CHAPTER 4

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF SUMMER SESSIONS

Evolution of Summer Administration to 1960

The patterns of summer session administration have evolved in a haphazard and unpremeditated fashion in contrast to patterns for administration during other academic terms. Early in the twentieth century when summer sessions were primarily voluntary unofficial activities privately conducted on college and university campuses by faculty, they were often administered by a faculty member who had time free from teaching. Faculty were compensated by tuition from enrolled students, and they decided whether to teach in summer, what courses they would offer, and the hours during which they would teach. The person acting as director would collect and transmit monies, keep the records, and maintain a degree of public order. Often the colleges whose facilities were being used insisted that the accustomed rules and regulations designed by academic year authorities for students in other terms and in effect during other parts of the year be applied and enforced. This situation caused difficulties, for the summer students differed markedly in age, purposes, and gender mix from other term students for whom regulations existed.

In the larger colleges and universities, various instructional units (colleges, departments, or divisions) offered their own separately constituted and directed summer sessions at different times as they deemed appropriate with no cooperation or coordination with each other. It is probable that institution-wide administrative procedures developed when the private and semi-private summer-time sessions held on the campus were given official sanction and direction by being absorbed into the work of the institution. By the 1930's, regular and continuing directors had been appointed, budgets were created, and policies had been formulated regarding programs, faculty recruitment, salaries, admissions, and credits. By 1940, these policies were established and enforced by the authorities for other terms in 61% of the institutions with summer sessions, by special committees in 20%, by directors in 11%, and by the staff in 8%. The staff developed the policies primarily in non-public and two-year colleges. While the evolution of administrative responsibility for summer sessions resulted in a state of orderliness compared to earlier years, the degree of standardization of practice was less than for other terms. It was evident that the status of summer session was different than other term sessions.[1]

Status of Summer Administration in 1960

Source of Administrators

Information collected from several sources by the U.S. Office of Education in 1960 revealed that, while a greater uniformity of administrative practices and structures than previously had developed for summer sessions, there was still more variety of administrative practice than was found regarding other terms. Most (87%) summer sessions were under the administrative supervision of a director or dean who was regularly employed by the institution. Sixty percent of the 898 directors on whom information was available held other administrative positions in their institutions. Of these 76% were presidents, vice presidents or academic deans; 7% were deans of evening college and/or extended services; 7% were registrars or admissions officers; 4% were deans of education; 3% were graduate deans; and 2% were deans of men or of students. Others were business managers. The other 40% of directors were faculty members assigned the summer administrative responsibility. By 1960, most summer administrators were recruited from the institutional regular administrative ranks.

Time Allocations

In only one institution of the 1,369 studied did a regularly employed summer session administrator devote his full time to summer session affairs. Most regularly employed summer directors of the 1,075 who responded (81%) had one-quarter or less of their annual services allocated to summer term administration, while 14% were allocated 26-50% of their time. Two and three percentages, respectively, devoted 51-75% and 76-99% of their time to summer administration. There was a variation in practice by both type of institution and geographical location. Sixteen percent of the universities compared to 41% of the liberal arts colleges and the teachers colleges allocated over one-half of the director's time to summer session administration. This practice reflected the greater enrollment size and program diversification of summer sessions in universities. In land grant universities, 20% of the summer session administrators devoted one-half time or more to summer session activities.[2]

Ten percent of the Rocky Mountain and 8% of the New England area responding institutions allocated over one-half of the director's time to summer session. Lowest percentages of directors with over one-half time allocated were in the Plains (4%) and Southwest (3%) regions. The amount of time allocated to the administration of summer term activities for preplanning and follow-up as well as conduct of the session itself is one measure of status which is accorded the summer term at a given institution.

Use of Advisory Committees

The existence of advisory committees for summer term activities had more than doubled during the two decades preceding 1960. By 1960, 49% of all responding institutions reported there was a committee established to advise the summer term administrator. Committees were most prevalent in universities (58%) with teachers colleges (54%) and liberal arts colleges (51%) also having them. Such committees were found in 63% of the land grant universities. Geographically, two-thirds of the Rocky Mountain area institutions reported the use of summer term advisory committees as did 64% of those in the New England area. Lowest percentages were found in the Southwest (44%) and Southeast (45%).

Nearly three-fourths (71%) of the existing advisory committees included both administrators and faculty; 8% consisted only of faculty members, and 21% were composed of administrators only. Since the members of these committees were appointed by the president, dean, or director in 56% of the institutions having summer advisory committees, it appears that the membership was more democratically organized than their method of selection. Nineteen percent of the committees consisted entirely of ex officio members, and only 3% were constituted by faculty election. A combination of means was used to constitute the memberships of other committees such as having some members elected and others either appointed and/or ex officio.

Advisory committees were labeled with such titles as administrative council, curriculum committee, academic affairs committee or committee of division/department heads. Of the 604 institutions reporting the use of advisory committees, 51% indicated the function of the committee was advisory only. The function was advisory only in 82% of the land grant universities. Some had other functions as well, such as program approval, faculty selection approval, budget approval, and other miscellaneous functions.

Role of Instructional Unit Chairperson

Detailed planning and organization by department or division chairpersons within their own units can be of much assistance to summer term administrators. In nearly three-fourths (74%) of the colleges and universities providing information, chairpersons were required to carry other-term responsibilities into summer session. Although this practice was fairly uniform among institutions in various geographical regions, there was considerable variation among types of institutions. In 97% of the universities, chairpersons performed their regular duties in summer also. This was the situation in liberal arts colleges (73%) and teachers colleges (79%). In land grant universities, the percentage was 93%. In general, reliance on chairs for assistance was more prevalent than reliance by the summer administrator upon advisory committees.

Financing Summer Sessions

In the early part of the 20th Century, when many of the first collegiate summer sessions were private faculty ventures without official institutional sponsorship or financial support, operating revenues consisted only of tuition monies collected from students. Due to the necessity for balancing income with expenditures and the fact that the ratio of summer to other term enrollments was generally lower than the ratio of summer to other term faculty size, summer salaries were inevitably lower than for other terms. The single source and paucity of operating revenue were possibly at the root of unprofessional competition among schools for students and the abuses of impaired academic standards, lowered admission requirements and higher rates of tuition and fees.

As collegiate institutions began to assume sponsorship of the summer activities, the principle of self-sufficiency was maintained. Most institutions were reluctant to weaken the sessions during other terms by diverting some funds to support summer activities considered to be adjunct and apart from the mainstream of educational activity and inferior to it. From this humble beginning, the extent to which summer sessions were financially distinct from the other academic terms or an integral part of them reflects the psychology of status accorded to summer session.

By 1960, slightly more than 74% of the 918 universities, liberal arts colleges, and teachers colleges reporting summer sessions included some operating costs as part of the twelve-month operating budget. This was the practice in 81% of the universities, 74% of the liberal arts colleges, and 71% of the teachers colleges. Summer sessions were included in the twelve-month budget with greatest frequency in the Southwest and Rocky Mountain areas and least in the New England and Far West areas.

Regardless of enrollment size, 76% of the universities devoted 10% or less of their fiscal year educational and general expenditures to funding the summer term. About 18% of the institutions with less than 10,000 enrollment expended 11%-20% compared to 15% of institutions with larger enrollments. Six percent of the larger institutions compared to 9% of the smaller ones devoted over 20% of their operating expenditures for support of the summer term. Of the smaller liberal arts colleges (2,500 enrollment or less), 73% expended 10% or less of their operating budget for summer session, while 86% of the larger institutions expended this much. Over one-fifth (22%) of the larger institutions spent 11% to 20% of their operating budget on summer session compared to 9% of the smaller ones. About the same percentage (4% to 5%) regardless of size devoted 20% of their budget to summer term. One-half the smaller (2,500 enrollment or less) teachers colleges compared to 43% of those larger spent 10% or less of their operating budget for summer term, while 14% of all devoted more than 20%. Teachers colleges devoting 11% to 20% were 35% and 43%, respectively, of small and large institutions.

Self-Support Budgets. An unpublished study revealed that in 1940, 54% of 350 collegiate institutions with summer terms indicated they were required to be self-supporting.[3] Twenty years later 51% of 1,231 institutions reported summer terms had to pay their own way. This was the case for 54% of the liberal arts colleges, 42% of the universities and 37% of the teachers colleges. Summer terms were required to be self-supporting in 31% of the land grant institutions. Self-support requirements were higher among private than public institutions. Summer terms in larger percentages of public colleges and universities in the Mideast and New England states were on self-support basis, and the lowest percentages were in the Southeast, Southwest, Plains, and Rocky Mountain regions. Largest percentages of summer terms in private institutions on a self-support basis were in the New England and Mideast regions and the smallest were in the Southeast, Southwest and Rocky Mountain regions.[4] That about one-half the collegiate summer terms were required to be on a self-support basis was seen as a major weakness in the status and operation of summer terms which had persisted over time. This requirement was cited as evidence that educational service during the summer period had not achieved financial equality with that provided during other terms.

Relation of Student Fees. The percentage of summer operating expenditures derived from student fees or tuition is another indicator of the extent to which summer educational activities are considered to be part of the year-long function of a college or university. In 1935 and 1940, 30% and 32%, respectively, of the institutions with summer sessions received less than 80% of their summer session revenues from students, and 60% and 52%, respectively, received all their income from that source. By 1960, only 0.07 of 1% of 1,369 institutions with summer sessions derived all revenues from students, and 47% received less than 75% of their summer revenues from students. While the change in proportion of summer term costs paid by students was slight between 1935 and 1940, students in 1960 summer terms paid a much smaller proportion of operating costs. Public collegiate institutions received smaller proportions of their summer operating costs from student tuition and fees than did private ones. Institutions in the New England and Mideast areas derived the largest proportions of summer costs from students, and institutions situated in the Rocky Mountain, Southwest, and Southeast derived the smallest proportion from that source. Percentages of institutions obtaining over three-fourths of their summer term costs from students were universities 53%, liberal arts colleges 59%, and teachers colleges 38%.

The extent to which colleges and universities depended upon summer operating costs from students was associated with enrollment size but not directly in linear fashion. Approximately three-fourths of the institutions with enrollments of 10,000 to 19,999 and 1,000 to 2,499 received one-half or more of the summer operating costs from students. This was the case for two-thirds of the institutions with enrollments of 5,000 to 9,999. Slightly over one-half (54%) of the institutions of 2,500 to 4,999 enrollment size realized one-half or more of the summer revenues from students, and only 47% of the institutions with over 20,000 students obtained one-half or more of summer revenues from students.

Scholarships and Research. Some institutions with undergraduate and graduate scholarship programs extend those provisions through the summer period. In 1960, 36% of the 1,025 institutions responding had undergraduate scholarship programs available in summer, and 18% had graduate scholarship programs available in summer. Although there were some summer sessions in which expenditures were made for research, the percentage of summer operating budgets expended for that purpose were not known. As might be expected, the total amounts expended for instruction and departmental research were highest in public universities.

Summer Sessions in the 1980s

Regional accrediting agencies have generally insisted that an institution of higher education identify clearly its mission(s), goals, and objectives as the basis for effective operation and evaluation. It is expected also that major functional and organizational components of a collegiate institution have articulated and meaningful statements of goals and objectives clearly aligned to those of the institution and the accomplishment of its mission(s). It is in terms of these alignments that organizational, financial, personnel, and curricular resources are examined and judged. Philosophically and logically, if the summer-time, organized educational programs and activities are to foster the accomplishment of the institutional mission(s) and goals, as a major component of the year long operation, there should be clearly articulated and identifiable goals for the summer. Statements of these goals should be approved by both the institutional community and the board of control following whatever procedures exist relevant to other major institutional functional or organizational components. Just as institutional mission and goal statements are periodically re-examined in view of changing environmental conditions, so should those of the major components, including summer sessions.

Although there were no reliable data collected during the 1970s on features of summer session organization and administration, several studies during the 1980s provided information on these and other characteristics of collegiate summer term/session development.[5] Information was obtained in 1982 from a one-third random sample (65) of all public institutions holding membership in either or both the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators (WASSA) or the North American Association of Summer Sessions (NAASS) and classified by Carnegie type as Research, Doctoral Granting, or Comprehensive Universities and Colleges. A usable response rate of approximately 85% was realized, and follow-up interviews at six universities confirmed a high level of validity in responses. The 1985 study was broadened in scope to include a 33% random sample stratified by Carnegie type of all public and private collegiate institutions in the United States. From this study was obtained a total response rate of approximately 94%. The Miller (1988) study was based on a random sample of 33% of all public and private liberal arts colleges in the United States, and the total response was 71%. Information from these studies is presented in subsequent sections of this chapter.

Philosophical Moorings

Although nearly all research, doctoral granting, and comprehensive institutions had a role and mission statement which had been approved or adopted by the governing board, only about one-fifth had such a statement for the summer session. A significantly (P = 0.01) larger percentage of institutions maintaining membership in one of the summer session associations than other institutions had a role and mission statement for the summer session. In only less than one in every ten institutions (9%) had a written mission and goals statement for the summer session been approved by the institutional community, including the central administration. However in 16% such a statement had been reviewed internally within the past three years. Significantly more comprehensive than research or doctoral granting, public more than private institutions, and those with over 8,000 fall headcount compared to smaller ones had institutional role and mission statements for the campus.

Most (95%) of the liberal arts colleges had a role and mission statement for the campus, and 90% indicated the statement had been adopted or approved by the governing board. Eleven percent had such a statement specifically for the summer session, and in 10% the statement had been approved by the institutional community including the central administration and had been reviewed within the past three years.

Policies and Procedures

Most collegiate institutions have developed codified manuals which set forth in writing the rules, regulations, and agreed upon practices for faculty, for students, and for budget and financial matters. In collegiate institutions where the summer programs and activities are not organized as genuine fourth quarters or third semesters in a year-round operation, there should be written statements of specific policies and procedures for the summer session. This is necessary to accommodate differences in the character of summer session due to variations in student clientele, faculty, curricular offerings, and financial arrangements. Not the least important are the needs to provide to academic deans and chairpersons guidelines for planning and procedures relevant to summer session but also to keep before the university community the role served and goals sought by the summer time programs and activities.

While the development of role and mission statements for summer session aligned with overall institutional goal and mission statements were generally lacking, in about three-fifths of the institutions, including liberal arts colleges, there was a written statement of specific policies and operating procedures (rules and regulations) for the summer session. Written operational statements existed in a significantly larger percentage ($P = 0.01$) of research, doctoral granting, and comprehensive institutions with membership in a summer session association than in other institutions. Since less than 1% of the liberal arts colleges held membership in any of the associations, no comparison was possible. Summer session operation was included in institutional by-laws of 29% of the liberal arts colleges, and about one-third of the other types of institutions. Nearly three of every ten institutions of all types had a handbook or other document for use by instructional unit administrators which contained statements of the mission and goals and/or operating policies and procedures for summer session. Significantly more public research, doctoral granting, and comprehensive universities in the Western and Northwestern accrediting regions than in other regions had written mission and goals statements for summer sessions. In significantly more private universities in the Southern and New England-Middle states regions than in other regions, summer session operation was included in the institutional by-laws. There was no difference among institutions by type (research, doctoral-granting or comprehensive). No differences existed among universities by type in whether they had a role and mission statement for summer session or a written statement of specific policies and operating procedures. Regional comparisons were not possible for liberal arts colleges since so few respondents were located in one-half the regions.

Purposes of Summer Sessions

Scattered throughout the literature extant about collegiate summer sessions are explicit opinions about the purposes which should be served. Other purposes have been implied, and much has been said about the opportunity the summer period offers for experimentation and creativity in program development. As part of the 1985 and 1986 studies, summer term session administrators provided information on purposes served at their institutions. These are shown by percentage in Table 3.

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGES OF INSTITUTIONS BY SUMMER TERM/SESSION PURPOSE

Purpose for Summer Term/Session	Percentage	
	Universities	LA Colleges
Provide courses for regular degree students	98	92
Permit regular academic year students to make up deficiencies	84	78
Provide courses for identifiable groups other than regular degree students	82	65
More fully utilize plant facilities	63	76
Provide summer employment for faculty	57	67
Provide income to the institution's general budget	54	69
Attract new admissions for the regular academic term	53	52
Offer special programs not regularly offered for selected groups such as alumni, senior citizens, etc.	40	40
Encourage and provide a setting for experimental offerings	39	30
Other purposes	5	6

When the purposes were rank ordered for universities by importance, the top three were the same as the three most frequently held as purposes for summer term/session, except that the second and third purposes were exchanged in position order. No differences existed in purposes between universities with or without association membership, but some other differences were present. A significantly larger percentage ($p = 0.05$) of the universities with separate summer sessions than those with summer term as an integral part of the year-round academic year offered special programs not regularly offered for selected groups. While there was a high level of agreement between public and private universities that the purpose of most importance was to provide courses during the summer to accommodate the institution's regular degree students, there were differences regarding the importance of other purposes. Public universities placed significantly ($P = 0.05$) more emphasis than did private ones on providing courses for identifiable groups other than regular degree students, providing summer employment for faculty, and attracting new admissions to the institution for the regular academic term. On the other hand, non-public universities placed significantly more emphasis on the purposes of better utilizing plant facilities and providing income for the institution's general budget. Public more than non-public universities emphasized the purposes of permitting regular academic year students to make up deficiencies and of encouraging and providing a setting for experimental offerings.

Data presented in Table 1 reveal that the two most frequently found purposes for summer session in liberal arts colleges coincided with those subscribed to by universities. However, the third ranked purpose for liberal arts colleges was to more fully utilize plant facilities in comparison to the provision of courses for groups other than regular students cited by university respondents. Larger percentages of liberal arts colleges than universities had as purposes not only the utilization of plant facilities but also the provision of income to the institution's general budget and employment for faculty. In fact, faculty employment and facility utilization were among the purposes considered most important by liberal arts colleges, while the three most important purposes cited by the universities all dealt with educational programs and services.

Organizational Structure

Heterogeneity describes best the organizational structures extant in four-year collegiate institutions for administering summer sessions. In approximately one-third of the universities and liberal arts colleges, the summer programs and activities are considered an integral part of the year-round operation and the same organizational and administrative structures exist as for other terms. There usually is not an official designated as dean or director of summer session, for the academic officers responsible for other terms are responsible also for the summer term.

In other institutions, organizational and administrative structures reflect wide differences among the institutions based on traditions, factors of historical development, ecological location, institutional missions and goals, and resonance of personalities. Reflected also are the viewpoints and philosophies held by past and current chief executives, and the expectations, views, and philosophies held by an institution's student catchment society as articulated by the board of control. The specific organizational structure(s) found in each collegiate institution for delivery of summer programs and activities are indigenous. They range from a total high degree of centralization, a highly centralized structure for part of the programs and activities surrounded by a host of decentralized parts, to a loosely coordinated decentralized system of structures.

In addition to identifying broad purposes common to summer sessions, recent efforts were made to discover broad patterns of organizational structures prevalent. Organizational placement of primary responsibility for summer session planning and implementation seems to reflect directly the status accorded the summer portion of the institution's total operation. In some instances one could wonder what the raison d'etre' was and why a few persons expend so much energy to operate any summer programs or activities except to have paid employment during summer.

In public universities, with small variance in percentages among institutional types (research, doctoral-granting, or comprehensive), 58% of the chief summer school administrators reported to a second echelon central office administrator such as an Academic Assistant or Vice Chancellor, Provost or Assistant/Associate Provost, Academic Vice President, Academic Dean, or Dean of Faculty. This was the administrative structure for 46% of the liberal arts colleges. In nearly one-third (32%) of the universities and one-tenth (10%) of the liberal arts colleges, the summer administrator reported to either a Dean/Director of Continuing Education and Summer Session or a Dean/Director of Continuing Education who in turn reported to one of the aforementioned officials. Two percent of the universities, all comprehensive by Carnegie classification, and 12% of the liberal arts colleges had the chief summer school administrator reporting to a President or Chancellor. Seven percent of the universities, and 31% of the liberal arts colleges had some administrative arrangement other than these. In only universities with less than 12,000 fall headcount enrollment did the summer school administrator report to the top institutional administrator. In general, as university fall enrollment size increased, the percentage of institutions decreased that had the summer term administrator reporting to a second echelon central office administrative official, and the percentage of institutions increased that had the summer term administrator reporting to a Dean/Director of Continuing Education and Summer Session or a Dean/Director of Continuing Education. The largest diversity of central level organizational structure for summer session was found among universities enrolling over 20,000 headcount students during fall term.

The nation-wide 1985 study revealed that two-thirds of all research, doctoral granting, and comprehensive types of universities considered the summer term as being separate from the regular academic (fall, winter, spring) year. In 26% the summer term was considered to be an integral part of the year-round operation and of coordinate or equal rank with other academic terms. Another 6% had some other arrangement, and 1% gave no response. Significantly (P = 0.01) more universities with semester or quarter calendars than those with other calendars had summer sessions organized separate from the regular academic year. There were no statistically significant differences in summer session organization based on enrollment size, geographical region, public or private control, institutional type, or summer session association membership. Between 1982 and 1985, change in administrative organization for summer term had occurred in about one-fifth of the universities, and mainly in the North Central and Western-Northwestern regions. Most of the changes resulted in the summer term becoming either a separate entity administratively or budgetarily, or both, or having the administrative responsibility for summer session subsumed under a continuing education, extended learning, other extension or public service unit, or another larger administrative unit such as academic affairs, registrar, etc. The degree of administrative centralization for programming had increased in 11% of the universities, decreased in 6%, and remained the same in others.

In liberal arts colleges 61% of the presidents and 54% of the summer session administrators considered the summer term programs to be separate, adjunct, or add-ons to the other terms, but 29% of the presidents and 38% of the summer session administrators considered them to be an integral part of continuous on-going degree programs offered in other terms. Eight percent of the summer administrators and 9% of the presidents either couldn't distinguish what the status was of summer term or believed it to be something different.

Operational Functioning Mode for Programming

There are three major and distinct patterns of operation for summer program planning. At one extreme, the chief executive responsible for summer programming takes primary responsibility for determining what courses and activities should be offered then seeks the resources for implementation. At the other extreme the sole responsibility for determining the courses and activities to be offered resides with the academic administrators and faculties of colleges, schools, or departments; the chief administrator of summer session performs the clerical and managerial tasks essential for coordination. A third pattern is a two-way communication process by which suggestions based on formal or informal needs assessments are made to academic units by the summer chief executive for their consideration. The chief summer executive receives from academic units their suggestions for offerings based on anticipated resources and needs as they perceive them. Through this process of mutual cooperation the academic programs and activities are developed. Sometimes a combination of patterns exist, especially of cooperation and coordination. In some instances where the usual pattern of cooperation and coordination exists a need which is not being met, hasn't been properly understood or sufficiently recognized by academic unit personnel, will be served by programs or activities organized and initiated by the summer session chief executive.

Only 5% of the university and 12% of the liberal arts college summer session offices took primary responsibility for development of the summer academic program. In about one-fourth (26%) of the universities and 10% of the liberal arts colleges, the summer session office staff developed the academic program in cooperation with departments, schools, and colleges, and in another one-fourth of the universities and 16% of the liberal arts colleges the summer session office coordinated the programs which had been developed by the academic units. In almost three of every ten institutions of all types, a combination of the latter two approaches, cooperation and coordination, were used. In 31% of the liberal arts colleges, some other approach was used for the summer session office to carry out its responsibilities.

For universities, the functioning mode of the summer session office was unrelated to type of institutional control (public or private), academic year calendar, enrollment size, geographical regional location, or how the summer term was institutionally organized (separate entity or integral part of academic year). Statistically significant differences were found by university type with more summer session offices coordinating programs developed by instructional units in research than in other types of institutions. The development of programs in cooperation with various types of academic units was found to be the most prevalent practice in comprehensive type institutions.

Financing Summer Sessions

Many of the traditions which persist in higher education evolved in a predominately agrarian society. Among the most seemingly permanent and ensconced features is the concept and widely held image that collegiate operation should begin in the fall and end in the spring. While war-time and enrollment boom periods have temporarily altered this notion, organizational behavior has reverted after crisis periods to the traditional mode. A segment of the professional and general public, however, have contended that education as an investment should be consistently paid for, if it is worth providing, during any period of the calendar year. As society transforms from an industrial age to an informational age with its greatly increased emphasis on the need of life-long learning for increasing proportions of the populace, there must be renewed attention to including adequate financial resources in the operating budgets to support educational programs and activities, regardless of what part of the calendar year they are provided. Since the preponderance of summer students have come to be regular students pursuing degree programs, it is difficult to discern a legitimate rationale for not financially supporting the same quality of educational work during summer as for any other period of the year. Not to do so seems quite inconsistent with the demands and needs of the current era of history. It is interesting that leadership in this regard has been exhibited most in the corn and wheat belt areas of the nation where the traditions of agriculture are most prominent.

Among all public and private research, doctoral granting, and comprehensive universities and colleges, 79% in 1984 included the budget for summer session in the total institutional budget just as for any other operational unit. This practice was found in a significantly (P = 0.02) larger percentage of universities in the North Central region and in a significantly ($P = 0.05$) larger percentage of institutions with summer session organized as an integral part of the year-round operation. This practice was found also in a significantly ($P = 0.05$) larger percentage of private than public universities and in significantly more non-association member institutions (NAASS or WASSA) than in member institutions. Significantly ($P = 0.05$) more public universities in the North Central region than in other regions had this practice.

Financial Self-Sufficiency--Self-Support. The concern about provisions for financing summer sessions/terms persisted during the 1970s and into the 1980s. In the financial support of public summer collegiate academic programs, there are gradations in the proportions of funds from state and student tuition/fee sources. Major categories of cost are instruction, administration, and overhead.

For effective communication and understanding a useful frame of reference has been established by summer session director Smith.[6] His definitions coincide with the connotation of the term self-support typically used by collegiate central office administrators, business officials, legislators, and people in general. Self-support is interpreted to mean those instances where the total program of summer credit-bearing courses is offered within the income generated solely by student tuition and academic fees. At the other extreme a state-supported summer session is one in which the credit-bearing courses are fully paid for by state-appropriated funds without being dependent upon income produced by tuition and/or fees. The fiscal operation of a state-supported summer session/term is virtually the same as that for the other terms, although it may be organized separately. Between the two extremes are state-assisted summer sessions whose academic programs are in part but not totally financed by state-appropriated funds.

Some summer session/term administrators however have been known to deviate from these commonly understood connotations by using a different frame of reference. That frame of reference begins and ends with only instructional costs. If all instructional costs are supported solely from student tuition and fees, the summer term is considered to be on self-support. Under this frame of reference some of these institutions may, in addition, defray all or a portion of the costs for administration and overhead from monies generated by students, but all are on self-support. If less than 100% of the instructional costs are paid from student generated monies, the summer program is not considered on self-support.

The distinction between frames of reference has been presented here with the hope it may be useful to administrators of all types in fostering more effective communication. The first frame of reference is used in this chapter in order that data presented are comparable and consistently derived.

After a study of practice in twenty-four large public and eight private colleges and universities Smith reported in 1972 that 53%, including all private institutions, were self-supported.[6] In the public institutions, 37% of the summer sessions were self-supported, 42% were state-assisted, and 21% were state-supported. At that time, as a result of summer sessions costs increasing at a rate faster than income generated from student tuition and fees, public institutions were changing from self-support to state-support. Some changes in fiscal policy were gradual, and others were dramatically abrupt. The institutional motive for changing from self-support was to provide a comprehensive, year-round program of studies for qualified students. In an effort to conserve on costs some universities eliminated the Office of Summer Session and placed responsibility with the Deans of Colleges. In all instances where this was done, enrollments declined and balance in course offerings was lost.

With a 68.3% response from 499 universities contacted in 1986, information on the degree of financial self-support for summer sessions was obtained.[7] In 73% of the 149 private institutions responding, student tuition and fees were expected to defray all summer session instructional, administrative, and overhead costs compared to that expectation in 37% of the 182 responding public institutions. In 9% of the private and 13% of the public collegiate institutions student tuition and fees were expected to pay for all instructional and year-round administrative costs, but in 13% and 16%, respectively, this source of revenue was expected to pay all instructional costs only. In 5% of the private and 34% of the public colleges and universities student tuition and fees were expected to defray less than all instructional costs and none of the administrative or overhead costs. In public institutions, 63% of the summer sessions were either state-assisted or state-supported. In 50% the revenues from student tuition and fees were not expected to pay for any administrative or overhead costs, and in 13% overhead costs were absorbed by the institution, while summer tuition and fees paid for all instructional and administrative costs. In 17% of the private institutions, summer session administrative and overhead costs were absorbed or paid for from funds other than student summer tuition and fees, while in 9% all overhead costs were absorbed by the institution, but tuition and fees paid for instructional and administrative costs.

Using the first frame of reference most typically used by collegiate central office administrators, summer sessions in 37% of the public and 73% of the private institutions were financially on self-support. Using the second frame of reference used by some summer session administrators this financial situation would be deemed to obtain in 66% and 96%, respectively, of the public and private institutions in that all of the direct costs of instruction are derived from revenue collected from students. Of the on self-support programs 76% and 87%, respectively, of public and private institutions utilized student generated monies to defray costs of administration and/or a portion of all of the associated institutional overhead costs. Thus, it can be seen that persons using the different frames of reference could grossly misunderstand each other. For the percentage of public institutions on self-support the difference in this case would be between 37% and 66%, a marked difference in perception.

A greater dependency on self-support monies for summer session was reported to have occurred in one-fifth of the universities between 1982 and 1984, but respondents were not asked how much. Increased dependency had occurred in a significantly larger percentage of universities located in the Southern and Western-Northwestern regions than those in other regions. This trend had been prevalent in a significantly larger percentage of institutions without membership in WASSA or NAASS than among those holding memberships. However, the trend was unrelated to size, type of institution, or whether summer term was an integral part of the year-round operation or organized as a separate entity. The degree of self-support prevailing among public institutions has not been adequately studied to warrant valid generalizations about the consequences of several levels of self-support or what is optimal, standard, or desired on a scale of values.

Some Pro and Con Considerations Regarding Financial Support. By the 1980s, collegiate summer curriculums in many institutions highly resembled the offerings and quality of instruction during other terms, thus enabling increasing numbers of students to continue their educational programs through out the year. Both state legislators and university officials in public institutions should recognize their responsibility to properly fund this increasingly important portion of the calendar year operation. Such funding is necessary to assure continuity, consistency, and quality of the total educational program which students deserve. The tendency to withdraw such support can seriously cripple the educational environment by introducing tentativeness and uncertainty for both collegiate officials responsible for planning summer programs and students wishing to progress toward degree completion.

Besides failing to adequately serve the economic interests of the state by neglecting summer educational programs and opportunities to meet modern day demands, public collegiate institutions tending toward higher degrees of self-support for the summer period than for other periods risk long-term monetary losses. Both the state and the university stand to lose funds. Money otherwise received by the state from tuition is lost and the university will find itself having to absorb an increased share of indirect costs. In this event funding becomes more contingent upon student enrollment and higher rates of tuition and fees. Money once allocated for the summer period is likely not to be given by the state to defray programs during other terms--it is simply cut from the state allocation.

Several ripple effects of high levels of self-support for summer programs have deleterious consequences. Such practice spawns a diversity of heavy salesmanship approaches for attracting students for summer enrollments. Course and program offerings are extricated from their educational context and placed in a stricter marketing context. This may destroy program balance and integrity, since offerings yield to popular areas with larger undergraduate enrollments in such fields as computer science, business and economics, mathematics, some types of engineering, and only certain types of general university requirement courses. Sometimes the latter may be even sacrificed. In states where enrollment restrictions have been imposed on public colleges and universities, students' only chance to take some required courses during summer, because of class enrollment maximums during other periods, are jeopardized. This is due to lack of assurance that such needed courses would be available.

Without the assurance of long range continuity provided by state formula funding, students pursuing graduate degree programs are particularly affected. Graduate programs which typically account for 30% to 45% of the summer period become substantially diminished, for they are generally high cost because of lower enrollments and higher instructional costs. When there are no assurances that tenured senior professors will be available who chair theses committees and provide individualized instruction through advisement on research studies, graduate students are reluctant to make long term work and personal plans to attend school.

It is a reality that there are various and persistent attitudes held by persons both on and off campus that cling tenaciously to the self-support concept. Some observers believe that a self-support policy causes officials responsible for program planning to assay better the needs and interests of students and to offer primarily those courses and programs for which students vote with their pocketbooks and feet. Therefore, it is contended that more effective planning results. If this same logic was applied to other term offerings as student interests wax and wane, there might be periods when offerings in some fields such as languages and other humanities offerings or certain liberal arts fields would be drastically curtailed or eliminated. Another observation is that during summer from an administrative perspective a self-support policy results in getting the "biggest bang for the buck," for other term work is crammed into shorter periods of time and more credit hours produced at a decreased unit rate of cost. If this condition has concommitant educational outcomes and values equivalent to those of other terms, perhaps it warrants more attention than has been given previously for reorganizing the entire university academic calendar.

Attitudes about and perceived advantages or disadvantages of the self-support concept during any term, especially summer, and what, in fact, is optimal, standard, or desirable may be associated with the proportion of enrollments which are graduate or undergraduate. They are probably associated with an institution's perceived role (place in the sun) mission, and ambition regarding what it is trying to become as a social institution. These perceptions may be related to how a degree of elitism in leadership is equated to quality in carrying out the social functions for which institutions of higher education exist.

As self-support increases, larger percentages of faculty are employed on a contingency contract. Not only are such contracts generally unacceptable to the better faculty members, but such practice makes it doubtful that high quality and graduate faculty can be attracted as are needed. Institutions that regularly attract a substantial number of students from out-of-state might find them reluctant to travel to campus for a summer program with the degree of tentativeness created by a high level of self-support. Higher quality faculty soon seek other summer opportunities for work on which they can depend; on the other hand some faculty are obliged to chase after students to make sure adequate class enrollments materialize. Faculty opt for large enrollment courses and are reluctant to assume responsibility for courses, committee memberships, other other assignments that do not generate substantial student credit hours. All this can produce a debilitating competition and anxiety among faculty members. The opportunity to use the summer period for developing new courses and experimenting with promising innovations is lost, for such activity becomes to risky to try. In some cases faculty, encouraged by circumstances, may back away from trying new ideas. When faculty and courses are on an enrollment contingency basis, the institution's assurance of holding the highest quality staff may diminish and students may develop reservations about planning to enroll for summer session with the possibility of course cancellations and absence of graduate advisers and committee chairpersons.

As the level of self-support increases higher tuition is necessitated to generate essential revenue, and this can impact enrollments, especially at the graduate level. In fact such a practice can lead to turf warfare among public collegiate institutions as well as internally among academic departments for the shrinking population of students.

Budget Administration and Allocations

The summer term administrator had authority to allocate budget to academic units within broad institutional guidelines in two-thirds of all universities of the three Carnegie types studied. This practice was found in significantly ($P = 0.01$) more public than private institutions.

Contingency contracts for summer term teaching faculty were used in three-fourths of the universities. This practice was found in a significantly (P = 0.01) larger percentage of New England-Middle States region universities than those in other regions. In this geographical area, a significantly larger percentage of institutions using such contracts had fall enrollments of under 8,000 than those with larger enrollments. Use of contingency contracts was found in a significantly larger percentage of public universities in the Southern and New England-Middle States regions than in other regions.

The basis for determining summer term faculty salaries changed between 1982 and 1984 in about one-fourth of the universities. This change had been significantly greater among public universities in the New England-Middle States region than in other regions and had taken place in significantly more institutions with over 8,000 fall enrollments than in those with smaller enrollments.

Relationships between types of budget-program practices and such factors as control, geographical location, size of fall enrollment, and summer term organization were analyzed, and differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level. Only significant findings from the 1985 national study of universities appear here. Significantly larger percentages of universities with summer sessions organized as an integral part of the year-round operation than those where summer session was considered a separate entity allocated a portion of the summer session budget for public service non-credit programs, graduate assistantships, and student cultural and social events.

Summer session budgets in approximately 40% of all universities included some monies for student cultural and social events such as dances, drama, lectures, tours, picnics, etc. Significantly more public than private institutions expended monies from the summer session budget for cultural and social events. This practice was found in significantly more institutions with fall enrollments under 8,000 than in larger ones. This was especially true of smaller private institutions than for larger ones. By region, enrollment size was unrelated to such expenditures except in the North Central region where significantly more universities with over 8,000 fall enrollment compared to those with smaller enrollment devoted monies from the summer session budget for such events. This was an exception to the general picture nationally where such events funded from the summer budget were predominately found in smaller institutions, especially the private ones.

Between one-fifth and one-fourth of all universities devoted a portion of the summer term budget (excluding indirect and/or overhead costs) to graduate assistantships, and 7% made faculty fellowships available from that budget. Most institutions supporting graduate assistantships expended 5% or less of the summer operating budget for that purpose. Among public universities in the North Central and Southern regions and among private universities in the Southern region, there were significantly larger percentages of graduate assistantships supported by monies allocated from the summer term budget than was the case in other regions. This practice was found in significantly more smaller size (less than 8,000 fall enrollment) institutions than in larger ones. A deviation from this general picture occurred in the North Central region where a significantly larger percentage of larger than smaller size institutions provided money from the summer budget for graduate assistantships. In only the Southern region was institutional size based on fall enrollment related to the support of faculty fellowships from the summer budget, and in that region the practice was found in significantly more universities with over 8,000 enrollment than in smaller ones. Generally, throughout the nation this practice was found in a significantly larger percentage of smaller size universities and in significantly more public than private ones.

A significantly larger percentage of universities that considered summer session as a separate entity than those where it was organized as an integral part of the year-round operation funded faculty research from the summer budget. Most universities supporting faculty research expended 8% to 12% of the summer operating budget for this purpose. The only significant difference found by region was that in the North Central area, significantly more public universities than in other regions allocated monies for this purpose from the summer budget. This practice existed in 13% of all universities.

Other than being found in significantly more universities where summer session was organized as an integral part of the year-round operation, the provision of public service non-credit programs was unrelated to institutional enrollment size, type, control, or geographical location. Most institutions providing these programs allocated about 5% of the summer session budget for the purpose. This practice existed in about 17% of all universities. No information was gathered about these matters from liberal arts colleges.

Summer Session Administrators

Who are the administrators of university summer sessions? What is their background? Where do they come from? What are their duties and responsibilities? What are their working arrangements? What have been their career patterns? What are their problems? Is there any relationship between career patterns and problems experienced? These questions are among those to which this section relates.

Educational and Work Background

In the early 1970s, information from 189 universities revealed that 76% of the summer session administrators held an earned doctorate, and 22% held a master's degree.[8] Young and McDougall found in 1982 that, among public universities holding membership in NAASS and/or WASSA, 67% held a doctor's degree, while 22% held a master's degree. Miller found that in liberal arts colleges 73% of the summer session administrators held a doctorate, 19% had a master's degree, 2% had a bachelor's degree, 2% had some other degree, and 3% didn't respond. Findings of the earlier study revealed that the educational backgrounds of university summer administrators represented 55 different areas of specialty with 43% being in education. A wide range of specializations was found in universities and liberal arts colleges with 36% of them in education for both groups. In descending order of frequency, specialty areas other than education in 1972 were humanities, social sciences, natural and physical sciences, and business. The prevalence of specialty areas for university administrators in 1982 were by frequency order social sciences, humanities, natural and physical sciences, and business. For liberal arts colleges the frequency order in 1986 was social sciences, humanities, natural and physical sciences, and business.

The available evidence indicates that, while the largest percentage of summer administrators have specialized in some aspect of education, the majority are distributed among other specialty fields with social sciences, humanities, and sciences predominate. Two dozen minor areas of specialization, with education and social sciences predominate, were found for approximately one-half of the administrators who had an academic minor. In addition, the major areas of specialization were similar for different types of universities except that the research universities and some of the comprehensive universities and colleges had summer session administrators whose major area of specialization had been the field of higher education.

Except in public universities where the summer term administrator reported to a Dean/Director of Continuing Education, most had been either a professor in the classroom or a professor who had entered into departmental or central administrative work. In this instance, 45% had been involved in a continuing education or extension unit, and 9% had been in central administrative work. In instances where the summer term administrator reported to a second echelon central administrator, 48% had been a classroom professor only or a professor who had become involved in departmental or central administrative work; 24% had been in continuing education or extension work, and 18% had been in only central administrative work. It was only in institutions where the summer term administrator reported to a Dean/Director of Continuing Education and Summer Session that the summer term administrators were persons with no prior educational experience (27%) who had gone into central level administrative work. It was in institutions with this pattern of organizational structure where the greatest diversity of career backgrounds existed among chief summer term administrators. In only 3% of the institutions where summer term administrators reported to a second echelon central administrator did the summer administrator have exclusive experience in that type of position. Summer term administrators, regardless of organizational structure in public institutions of the Carnegie types studied and holding membership in WASSA or NAASS, typically emerged from either the professoriate or work in a continuing education or extension unit. Eight of every ten summer session administrators in public doctoral-granting and seven of every ten in research and comprehensive universities held their next preceding position in the same institution.

Nearly six of every ten summer administrators in comprehensive institutions had held four or five positions prior to their present job as had 50% in research universities and 43% in doctoral-granting institutions. Approximately seven of every ten summer session administrators had held at least three previous positions prior to becoming summer session administrator.

Provisions for Administrative Leadership

The comprehensive 1985 study of public and private institutions revealed that the summer session administrator in about one-half of all universities served as an ex-officio member of appropriate faculty senate committees such as those concerned with calendar, budget, academic affairs, etc. This practice was found in significantly ($P = 0.01$) more institutions with fall head count enrollments over 8,000 than in those with smaller enrollments and in significantly more public than private institutions of the larger size. This practice was found in significantly ($P = 0.05$) more comprehensive universities and colleges than in research or doctoral-granting institutions. According to liberal arts summer session administrators this practice only occurred in about one-tenth of the colleges.

The amount of time devoted both during the summer and during the rest of the year to the management of summer sessions may be indicative of the importance and status ascribed by a college or university to the summer portion of the calendar year. In only 6% of all research, doctoral granting, and comprehensive colleges and universities did summer session administrators in 1984 devote 70% or more of their time during the rest of the year to summer session planning and programming. In only 8% of the liberal arts colleges did the summer session administrators devote 60% or more of their time during the regular term. These percentages compared to 10% found by Heidenreich (1965).[9] In universities, another 9% devoted 40% - 69%, and 13% devoted 30% - 39%. The median amount of time during the year spent in 1984 in universities on summer session was 19%, nearly one-fifth of the time. The median amount of time in liberal arts colleges was 13.5%. During the 1984 summer session, 26% of the university summer session administrators devoted 70% or more of their time to management of the session, and another 18% devoted 40% to 69% of their summer period time this way. In liberal arts colleges, 21% devoted 60% or more of their time in summer to management. The median amount of time devoted during the summer session to its management in universities was 44%, and in liberal arts colleges the percentage was 32%. In 1965 Heidenreich had found that 61% of the 274 summer session administrators spent 70% or more of their time during summer on management.

The amount of time devoted in universities either during the year or in summer to summer session management was unrelated to academic calendar, fall headcount enrollment size, public or private control, or how the summer session was administratively organized in the institution. Highly significant (P = 0.01) differences existed between universities holding membership in one of the summer session associations and those that did not. Summer session administrators in association member institutions in general devoted more time to summer session management both during the regular year and during the summer.

Individuals performing as administrator of summer sessions in collegiate institutions are designated by a wide variety of titles. Nelson found that 40 different titles were used in four-year colleges and 45 were used among universities. Interestingly, only 30% of the former and 57% of the latter were titles which related directly to the summer session responsibility. Approximately 13% carried dual titles of summer session and something else; over one-half the titles in four-year colleges and about one-third in universities did not reflect summer session responsibilities. Heidenreich (1965) had found that 81% of the 274 summer session administrators responding to his study had a title of dean or director, and 100% of the jury of experts indicated such a title should be given to the chief summer session administrator.

Other Responsibilities of Summer Administrators

Nearly all (95%) of the summer term administrators in public research, doctoral granting, and comprehensive universities or colleges were found in 1982 to have other academic or administrative duties. This was the case in 92% of the liberal arts colleges. In public research universities, 30% had other academic responsibilities and held rank in some academic field compared to 18% and 12%, respectively, in doctoral-granting and comprehensive institutions. In liberal arts colleges, only 6% had other academic responsibilities. The largest percentages (47% and 60%, respectively) in comprehensive and liberal arts institutions had central administrative responsibilities compared to 40% and 27%, respectively, in research and doctoral-granting universities. None of the summer term administrators in research universities were college, school, or departmental administrators, but that was the case in 18%, 16% and 3%, respectively, in doctoral-granting, liberal arts, and comprehensive institutions. One-fifth of the summer administrators in research universities, approximately one-third in doctoral-granting and comprehensive institutions, and 11% in liberal arts colleges had some additional type of responsibility other than those mentioned above.

Powers and Functions of Summer Session Administrators

Over two decades ago Heidenreich[10] compared the powers and functions which 274 summer session administrators reported as always or frequently having in accredited four-year institutions with those which a jury of ten eminent authorities believed they should have. The powers and functions related to instructional administration, curriculum, faculty, students, and general university administration. The relationship between practice, as reported by summer session administrators, and what the experts indicated it should be was substantial but not high (rho = 0.74). Higher percentages of administrators indicated they always or frequently had responsibility for certain things than jury members thought they should have. Those things were determining summer session faculty salaries, assigning classrooms and facilities, student attendance and discipline, advising on summer session student admissions policies, and student registration procedures. On the other hand, larger percentages of the jury believed summer session administrators should have responsibilities for some things than the administrators reported they had. Those things were autonomy in budget expenditures, publicity and public relations, submission of an annual report, the instructional program, revisions in course offerings, approval of departmental offerings, editing the summer session bulletin, appointing visiting faculty, determining instructional faculty teaching load, giving leadership regarding student fees, class load maximums, etc., and responsibility for pre- and post-session clinics, workshops, institutes, and the like.

The comprehensive nation-wide 1985 study (Young and McDougall) sought not only to determine the types of major responsibilities carried out by summer term/session administrators, but it also focused on changes which had occurred since 1982 during an era of general fiscal retrenchment. Major responsibilities were defined as those for which the summer term administrator had more responsibility than anyone else. These are presented in Table 4.

As can be seen, the five predominant responsibilities of summer session administrators were (1) editing the summer session bulletin, (2) cancelling low enrollment classes, (3) setting policy on minimum class size, (4) publicity and public relations, and (5) preparing the summer instructional budget. With the exception of cancelling classes, these were responsibilities for which there had been the greatest increases since 1982. To them was added the approving or disapproving of class offerings for which responsibilities had increased most.

Significantly (P = 0.05) larger percentages of summer session directors in private than public universities and colleges indicated they had major responsibility for publicity and public relations (marketing), approval of course offerings, class cancellations due to low enrollments, revisions in course offerings, editing the summer session bulletin, establishing summer school fees and tuition, authorizing refunds for deposits and course withdrawals, advising on student admissions policy, and setting maximum student class loads. No differences existed according to enrollment size, region of location, calendar, or summer session administrative organization. Responsibilities for public relations and publicity, cost-income analyses, and for holding pre- and post-session activities had increased in significantly more non-association member institutions than in those holding memberships in a summer session association. Significantly more change in responsibility for determining salaries for visiting faculty and in the establishment of summer session fees and tuition had taken place in comprehensive and doctoral-granting than in research universities. Whereas there had been increase in responsibilities for these matters within comprehensive institutions, the converse was the case in doctoral-granting universities.

Listed below are the top ten duties by percentage in order of frequency with which liberal arts summer session administrators indicated they performed them. Asterisks indicate the duties considered by the largest percentages to be among the five most important. Those duties were:

Cancel low enrollment classes	(81%)	*Conduct publicity programs	(60%)
*Edit summer session bulletin	(70%)	Assign classrooms/facilities	(59%)
Set minimum class-size limits	(65%)	Set minimum class load	(48%)
*Prepare summer session budget	(64%)	Submit annual report	(45%)
*Revise course offerings	(60%)		

TABLE 4
PERCENTAGE BY MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY AND CHANGE SINCE 1982

Type of Responsibility	Have Major Responsibility	Change	
		Increase	Decrease
Edit summer session bulletin	69	12	2
Cancel classes due to low enrollment	65	8	2
Set policy on minimum class size	64	10	2
Publicity and public relations	62	16	4
Prepare instructional budget	59	9	2
Approve or disapprove course offerings	56	10	3
Submit annual report	52	4	1
Conduct cost-income analyses	51	8	1
Revisions in course offerings	46	5	2
Student registration procedures	41	3	1
Assign classrooms and facilities	41	5	2
Determine salaries for visiting faculty	41	4	1
Appoint visiting faculty	39	4	3
Set student maximum class load	39	6	1
Monitor drop/add process	39	2	2
Authorize funds for dropouts	37	3	2
Authorize course withdrawals	36	1	2
Advise on student admissions policy	29	3	1
Pre- and post-session clinics, workshops, seminars, or institutes	26	4	1
Distribute and collect grade sheets	23	2	1
Establish fees and tuition	23	2	1
Arrange summer graduation exercises	12	2	0
Student disciplinary action	10	0.5	0.5
Establish on-campus housing policies	6	0	0.5

Tied for tenth place by 44% of the administrators were the duties of recruiting summer session students,* determining resident faculty salaries, and monitoring the course add/drop process. Sixteen percent indicated they administered or directed pre/post session clinics, seminars, workshops, and institutes; 9% coordinated summer session programs abroad, and only 8% were found to conduct research. Next in order of importance were the duties of canceling low enrollment classes, setting minimum class-size enrollments, and submitting an annual report.

A review of the major responsibilities of summer term/session administrators indicates that they are preoccupied mainly with the administrative mechanics of summer term operation. Duties thought to be the most important were those which give sustenance to the summer programs.

Problems Related to Summer Term/Session

During the latter part of the 1970s decade, Deal[11] sought to determine the rank order importance which summer session deans or directors in North American Association of Summer Sessions member institutions would ascribe to eleven suspected problem areas. The responses from 243 institutions were analyzed for public and private four and two-year institutions having more and less than 2,500 summer students. The problems ranking among the top five of most importance by both public and private institutions, regardless of summer session enrollment size, were (1) optimum scheduling of summer sessions, (2) marketing summer session programs, (3) budget development and administration, and (4) serving non-traditional student needs. Among public institutions with fewer than 2,500 summer session students and private institutions of larger size summer enrollments, a fifth problem area cited as important was summer sessions as related to institutional goals. In larger size public institutions, the fifth problem area cited was evaluation of student reaction to summer programs, while in smaller size private institutions the fifth problem area cited was short term summer programming. Other suspected problem areas not among the top five in importance to one group or the other were evaluation of faculty performance, summer study abroad programs, inter-institutional summer session cooperation, and mutual determination of faculty compensation. Deal concluded that the problem of most importance to summer session administrators was marketing the programs.

Importance of Problems Experienced

Problems experienced by summer session administrators were again studied in 1982 among public universities holding membership in either or both NAASS or WASSA. Of sixteen suspected problems, summer term administrators were asked to indicate the three in order of importance they considered most important. Four respondents added problems not listed, and none considered as problems study abroad programs or adjusting heavy loads of faculty in summer including graduate committee service. Two problems were most frequently cited as first and second rank in importance. They were securing adequate funds for summer programming and determining a basis for summer session faculty salaries. These problems were mentioned in second and third place as the one of third rank in importance after the implementation of innovative and experimental programs. Other problems mentioned with greatest frequency as first choice in importance were implementing innovative and experimental programs and image of summer session as contributing to institutional mission and goals. Cited as a problem of both second and third rank in importance was determining the effectiveness of program marketing methods. Another problem cited fourth in frequency as a problem of second level importance was budget development and administration. Fifth in frequency order as a problem identified as third rank of importance was publicizing summer school activities.

Liberal arts college summer session administrators indicated the problems of most importance were (1) publicizing summer school activities, (2) determining the effectiveness of program marketing methods, and (3) getting highly qualified staff to teach summer session courses. Other predominate problems identified next in order of importance were those regarding the image of summer session as contributing to institutional mission and goals, implementing innovative and experimental programs, and communicating with the administration and faculty regarding the function and importance of summer session. Only small percentages (4% or less) had any problems relative to summer foreign study programs, meeting students' demand for enrichment and recreational activities, the allocation of credit for short-term and non-traditional activities, or adjusting to heavy faculty loads including graduate committee work. The programming of short-term summer activities and accommodating enrollment increases were cited as problems by 9% and 6%, respectively. From 11% to 15% of the summer administrators indicated they had problems in developing standards for workshops, institutes, travel tours, or extension courses, determining a basis for summer session faculty salaries, securing adequate funds for summer programming, budget development and administration, or faculty performance evaluation. Seventeen percent indicated the evaluation of summer session program activities was a problem.

Problems considered as most important varied by institutional type. The most important problem cited by research university summer directors was implementing innovative and experimental programs. In doctoral-granting and comprehensive universities or colleges the problem cited most was securing adequate funds for summer programming. In liberal arts colleges, the problem cited most as important was publicizing summer school activities.

Relationship of Problems and Career Patterns of Administrators

It had been a hunch of the author that problems experienced and cited by summer term administrators might somehow be related to their own career patterns. From listings of prior types of positions held by summer term administrators, eight distinct patterns emerged. They were: professor, professor to central academic administration, professor to departmental administration, continuing education or extension staff and administration, central administration other than academic, public school staff to central administration, student to summer term administrator, and non-university (business/industry) to central administration. Proper statistical analyses revealed that there was no relationship between career patterns of summer administrators and the types of problems cited as most important. Regardless of the professional and work backgrounds of summer term administrators in public research, doctoral-granting, and comprehensive institutions holding membership in NAASS or WASSA, problems related to summer term seem to be universal and generic.

Conclusions Regarding Problems Cited

While the concern about the securing of funding and budget development and finding a basis for reimbursing faculty seemed to be pervasive, there was concern about the implementation of innovative and experimental programs and fostering the image of summer session as making a contribution to the institutional mission and its goals. Concerns about publicizing summer activities and evaluating program marketing methods were secondary in importance within universities to the others but high on the list of concerns within liberal arts colleges. In an era of financial retrenchment in higher education and a trend in some regions of the nation toward a greater reliance on self-support, it seems only logical that the top level concern of all public institutions as a group would be related to finance. It is, however, heartening to discover the professional concern extant for the philosophical tenet that summer session affords opportunity for innovation and experimentation as a justification for its existence and perpetuation.

Summary

The reader was presented such information as existed on the evolution and status of various features of the organization for and administration of summer sessions prior to and as of 1960. Such topics as sources of administrators, their time allocations, and use of advisory committees were discussed. The role of the instructional unit official and matters regarding financial support were also presented. Information on the nature and characteristics of organizational and operational administrative features, primarily during the 1980s was derived from several major studies conducted throughout the decade. Data were presented regarding the recent status and characteristics of summer session operation, including financial support, organizational structure, purposes, and qualifications of and problems experienced by administrators responsible for planning and implementing summer sessions. Information gathered in the 1980s was much more comprehensive and detailed than existed previously, but on some matters such as financial support the reader can make comparisons with conditions as they existed in 1960 to gain perspective.

Chapter 4 -- Endnotes

1. U.S. Office of Education, Summer Sessions in Colleges and Universities of the United States 1960, by Donald F. Warner, et al., Circular No. 700. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), 44.

2. Ibid., 45-47.

3. "Summer Sessions," unpublished Survey of Summer Schools in the Files of the U.S. Office of Education reported in Frank K. Foster, "Summer Sessions for Teachers," National Survey of the Education of Teachers, Volume III (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933).

4. U.S. Office of Education, Summer Sessions in Colleges and Universities of the United States 1960, pp. 28-29.

5. Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall, Relationships of Selected Factors to Summer Session Organizational Structure (Calgary: University of Calgary, Continuing Education Faculty, 1982); Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall, Recent Changes in Summer Session of U.S. and Canadian Colleges and Universities, (St. Louis: North American Association of Summer Sessions, 1985); John E. Miller, "Factors Associated with Summer Sessions in Selected United States Private and Public Liberal Arts Colleges." (Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University, 1989).

6. Clodus R. Smith, Higher Education in the Summer: A Comparison of Thirty-Two Summer Sessions (College Park, Maryland, National Association of Summer Sessions Research Committee, Office of Summer Programs, University of Maryland, 1972), 1-15.

7. Lewis Butler, 1986 Summer Associations Joint Statistical Report. Alfred, New York: Alfred University, 1986.

8. Michael U. Nelson, "A Survey of Summer Session Administration: A Sample of 189 Universities," A Research Report for the Association of University Summer Sessions (St. Louis: Association of University Summer Sessions, 1972).

9. Charles A. Heidenreich, "A Study of the Functions and Powers of Summer Session Directors in Selected Institutions of Higher Education in the United States" (Ed.D. dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1965).

10. Ibid.

11. William M. Deal, Jr.,"Major Problems of Summer Session Administration," A Study Conducted for the Research Committee of NAASS. (St. Louis: North American Association of Summer Sessions, 1977).

CHAPTER 5

SUMMER CURRICULUMS AND INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

The scope of both purposes and offerings of summer terms in collegiate institutions widened over the past seven decades as categories of students other than teachers, teacher candidates, and students seeking to make up deficiencies were attracted. By 1932, courses designed for students representing all levels of achievement were typically offered in nearly all departments at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.[1]

Summer Session Offerings in the Early 1930s

Although summer offerings had been previously for the inservice and pre-service credentialing of teachers, by the 1930s they were available for high-school students preparing for college entrance, for superintendents and principals, for college professors and administrators, for college alumni, for persons interested in work for its cultural value, and for persons upgrading their training for special fields in industry and business. New curricula and experiments of various kinds that could not be undertaken during the regular school year were being tried out during summer term. Numerous colleges and universities were striving constantly to make summer session offerings attractive to an increasing number and variety of students. In 1931, summer sessions were offered in 50.6% of the colleges and universities and 74% of the teachers colleges and state normal schools listed by the U.S. Office of Education in its directory.[2]

Novel Features

By the 1930s collegiate institutions were offering a variety of summer educational opportunities besides on campus instruction.

Travel courses. Travel courses or study tours in which students spent six or eight weeks in foreign or domestic travel were offered for college credit toward degree programs.[3] Such tours were made to nearly all quarters of the world, however Europe was the predominate place of foreign travel. On these tours classes were held and lectures given by faculty on board ships, trains, motor buses, and at points en-route.

Examples included a fifth annual European tour sponsored by the College of the Pacific which lasted 56 days and covered nine countries in which students could earn two credits each in appreciation of art and history of music courses. A library bearing on the subjects was taken along as part of the necessary instructional equipment. A two-month seminar in social science was sponsored in Paris by Northwestern University, and a geographical field course conducted in the more important European industrial areas focused on a study of harbors. College credit courses in French civilization, Renaissance, and the Reformation were offered during a European tour by the College of Idaho. Wichita State University offered a four-semester hour course for twenty students in painting (oil, water color, and pencil) and a two-semester hour course in art appreciation during a six-week tour through Holland and France. Both Columbia and Rutgers Universities offered credit courses for the study of foreign school systems in several European countries including Germany and Russia. In addition, field courses in science and science education were offered for credit in Germany by Columbia University. Credit courses were offered by Hunter College in art appreciation and art history, Greek and Roman civilization, and western Europe during a tour of selected appropriate European countries. The University of Oregon in cooperation with the University of Hawaii offered credit courses in geography of the Pacific, sociology and anthropology, South Sea literature, and education. Courses also offered by the University of Oregon during a summer cruise to Alaska were Pacific Northwest history, sociology and anthropology, botany, art, geology and geography, and State and Territorial administration. A forty-day trip to the Hawaiian Islands was provided by the University of Washington for a credit course in geography. Both Clark and New Mexico Universities separately offered field study trips to Mexico City and vicinity. The former also provided credit courses through extended field trips in the Caribbean. These examples are not all inclusive of institutions providing courses through organized summer term tours, but they suffice to describe the scope and nature of such summer credit activities which flourished in the early 1930s.

Besides foreign study tours, a large number of collegiate institutions conducted credit courses principally in geology, geography, and biological sciences during organized tours throughout the United States and Canada. Such institutions as the University of Nebraska, Western Reserve University, University of Wisconsin, Columbia University, Iowa State University, Cornell University, University of Missouri, Ohio State University, and Harvard University were among those that offered summer credit courses through field study during North American travel tours and at regional or specific sites out of state. Some of the study sites included the Rocky Mountain states, the Pacific Northwest, Glacier and Yellowstone National Park areas, the Adirondacks, Green Mountains in southeastern Vermont, the Appalachian region of eastern Tennessee, Niagara Peninsula in Ontario, Wisconsin, and the historic garden, county, state, and national park centers of the southern and eastern portions of the United States.

Summer Session Camps. In 1874, the University of Michigan established a summer camp and is credited with being a pioneer in this development. The success of brief excursions to points in proximity by classes in the natural sciences to supplement classroom work was a factor which led to the establishment of permanent summer camps for the conduct of research in not only various fields of science but also certain branches of engineering, for example surveying. The Pennsylvania State University pioneered in developing a summer nature camp amid the Seven Sister Mountains in Stone Valley. Cornell University organized a summer field school in geology near Tyrone in Central Pennsylvania. A permanent summer camp or field station was maintained by the University of Chicago south of St. Louis in St. Genevieve County Missouri where field work in geology was conducted. Louisiana State University had a permanent forest school camp at Bogalusa, Louisiana. A summer camp for science study in the Colorado National Park Forest was developed by the University of Colorado. Iowa State University maintained a permanent surveying camp on Rainy Lake in northern Minnesota, and the University of Michigan had a permanent camp for similar purposes at Jackson Hole, Wyoming. The University of Pittsburgh maintained a permanent camp for surveying in the Allegheny Mountains at Camp Hamilton. Most of the field work in surveying and railroad engineering offered by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) was done on a 850 acre camp site at Gardner's Lake near East Machias, Maine. They also had a permanent summer camp for mining practice near Dover, New Jersey. The University of Wyoming developed a permanent summer camp in the Medicine Bow Mountains for full-time courses in botany, geology, and zoology. Some of the camps were well equipped for college work and provided satisfactory convenient living quarters for faculty and students, but the adequacy of facilities varied among them. The examples cited above represent only some of the types of permanent camps established for summer credit work by collegiate institutions.

Summer Branches. Some universities and colleges established one or more branches in more convenient locations than the main campus for the offering of summer courses which were both similar to and different from those offered on the main campus. Among the collegiate institutions having summer branches were the University of Wyoming, University of Oregon, University of Pittsburgh, Claremont Colleges, Pennsylvania State University, Boston University, Fresno State University, Brigham Young University, and New York University. Several metropolitan universities transferred summer activities to rural locations favorable to climates conducive to health and learning. Some developed branches in outlying locations of a large metropolitan area, and some rural institutions developed branches in more densely populated portions of their service regions. Some of the mountain and lake locations were initially selected for summer branches because of opportunities afforded for natural laboratory work in the sciences.

Biological Laboratories. One of the oldest biological laboratories was at Woods Hole, Massachusetts, and it accommodated research and instructional activity also in biochemistry and biophysics. In the early 1930s approximately 100 universities, colleges, and research organizations subscribed annually to the laboratory for summer activities when laboratory material was most available. Many universities maintained their own laboratories or stations to which they transferred most, if not all, of their summer work in biology. For example, Stanford University conducted all of its summer work in botany, physiology and zoology at a station in Pacific Grove, California. For nearly four decades Indiana University maintained both graduate and undergraduate credit summer courses at its Winona Lake, Indiana station. Both graduate and undergraduate credit in botany and zoology courses had been offered for at least two decades by the University of Michigan at its station on the shore of Douglas Lake. The University of New Hampshire had a marine zoological laboratory on the Isle of Shoals near Portsmouth, and the University of Pittsburgh maintained as a department of their graduate school a biological laboratory on Presque Isle, Erie, Pennsylvania. Physical and chemical oceanography, and marine botany and zoology for seniors and graduate students were taught during summers at their Friday Harbor field laboratory on the San Juan archipelago.

Training for Outdoor Leadership. Intensive summer credit courses ranging in duration from two to eight or nine weeks were offered by a number of collegiate institutions for training leaders for youth outdoor organizations. Western Reserve University was one of the few, if not the only collegiate institution, maintaining a school devoted exclusively to training outdoor leaders. While the Nature Guide School was intended primarily for Cleveland public school teachers, it enrolled summer time students from all over the nation. Certificates were awarded on successful completion of the course. A one-hour summer course was offered by the University of Michigan in scouting to prepare scout leaders and directors of summer youth camps. The State University of Iowa offered four units of work for women which consisted of work in canoeing, swimming, camp craft, and camp education. A scouting course consisting of a combination of lectures, practical scout and camp work, was offered for training leaders of boys at Boston University. A two-hour course in essentials of scout leadership to train women Girl Scout leaders was offered by Ohio University, and New York University provided a course for women in the organization and administration of camp-fire programs. At the University of Notre Dame in cooperation with the boy life bureau of the Knights of Columbus a 10-day course was offered in the principles and technique of boy leadership for priests and laymen expecting to direct boys' activities or to serve on committees sponsoring boys' work. A number of state teachers colleges and other universities offered training courses for scout leadership; most were for credit, but some were not.

Music and Art Activities. To supplement regular year credit courses in music, a number of collegiate institutions offered opportunity to participate,without charge, in a choral or orchestral organization. Some awarded academic credit but most offered the performing work for its cultural and pleasurable values. Other institutions held 6-week round tables in music and dramatic arts for adults working in those areas, but some were offered for high school students with outstanding ability in art and music. Courses were offered in jewelry making and metal work in some institutions and at Boston University two hours of course credit was granted. A one-week grand opera with regular stage productions utilizing well-known grand opera artists was conducted at the University of Georgia.

Summer Programs for Special Groups. During the latter years of the 1920s interest in parental education and child welfare work was heightened by funds from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Foundation that were available to assist in the establishment at several leading universities of child welfare institutes. Courses were offered during summer term for parents interested in training for preschool children and individuals wishing to become discussion group leaders in parental education. Some offerings included child psychology and development, child care and training, principles of kindergarten and nursery school education, story telling for young children, mental and social development of young children, methods and materials for parent education, special problems in child development, techniques of guidance, and other related courses. Use was usually made of existing nursery and/or kindergarten schools for practical experience and training through guided observation and participation.

Although the first course in college teaching was probably offered for prospective college teachers at Yale University during the 1923-24 academic year, by the early 1930s many summer courses were offered in various phases of college and university work. Courses in the organization and administration of higher education began the same year at Columbia University, and by 1931 varied offerings had appeared as summer term offerings in a number of large universities. Chief among them were the Universities of Chicago, Michigan, Pittsburgh, and Ohio and both Columbia and Stanford Universities. Besides summer institute for college and university administrators, the summer courses at the University of Chicago included organization and administration of colleges and universities, problems of college instruction, financial administration of higher institutions, professional duties of deans and registrars, administration of student personnel in higher institutions, the junior college and its organization and administration, the organization and administration of teacher-training institutions, and problems of instruction in teacher- training institutions. Summer offerings at Columbia, Ohio State, and Michigan Universities were somewhat the same but a little less extensive, while some universities such as California and Washington limited their summer offerings in higher education to a course on the junior college.

The practice of offering short-term intensive courses for special groups either for credit or no credit to meet the needs of persons who found it impossible to attend regular summer term sessions had developed by the 1930s. In instances where credit was granted, short sessions of two or three weeks were held before or after the regular summer term. Some were scheduled concurrently while the regular summer term was in session. Usually students were permitted to enroll in only one course. Sometimes a brief intensive session dealt with only one unit of a course, and credit was granted only after all units had been completed. Special groups served were teachers, social case workers, counseling and guidance personnel, coaches, and recreational workers.

In other instances, intensive non-credit courses of immediate practical value to special groups were offered. Examples of such subjects were farm valuation for appraisers, coal mining for persons aspiring to become a mine foreman or fire boss or preparing to teach mining classes under the Smith Hughes Act, custodial work for school building custodians, and subjects designed to prepare students to enter different phases of the cotton business as producers, buyers, cotton clossers (grading and stapling of samples), warehouse manager, and marketing specialists. Various universities organized choruses and orchestras for high school students especially gifted in vocal or instrumental music; such music groups sometimes served as practical laboratories for college students in music education and demonstration schools for school administrators. Among the universities with flourishing programs were Iowa State University, Washington State University, and the Universities of Missouri and Minnesota. As early as 1920 Bryn Mawr College had begun a summer school for women industrial workers. Similar summer programs were being held a decade later by Barnard College, University of Wisconsin, and Clemson.

Following the 1915 lead of Middlebury College, a number of colleges and universities had developed summer foreign language schools or houses for the full-time intensive study of languages. The first summer school devoted to the study of English was also founded by Middelbury at its Bread Loaf Green Mountain location.

Institutes. Short period institutes were organized during the summer to focus on specific phases of educational work, and they were extended to such fields as government, politics, public health, social relations and many other fields. Such topics as World Economic Planning, International Relations, Pacific Relations, and Public Affairs were common. A number of universities were experimenting with one-week institutes for alumni. These institutes were usually held for a five-day period immediately following commencement when former graduates were invited to participate in a brief educational program. These institutes included lectures in such subjects as English literature, government and law, psychology, fine arts, drama, music, economics, heredity, geology, social evaluation and football coaching combined with opportunities for recreation, getting acquainted, and renewing college relationships.

Institutes were also held for officers of classroom teachers associations, representatives of radio stations and broadcasting systems, and administrators of higher education institutions.

Conferences. Universities and colleges were active in sponsoring summer special interest group conferences. These ranged from a conference on character education, foundations of education, and education for Federal service to leadership for rural leaders, and parent education. Other conferences were held for library workers both school and public, bandmasters, ministers and others interested in religious education, mine foremen, textile mill over seers, and trade-union representatives.

Among the innovative and new type conferences coming into being were those focusing on creative writing. Leading the way in developing conferences for aspiring writers were Middlebury College, Montana State University, University of Colorado, and Alabama College.

Interinstitutional Cooperation. There had developed a tendency around the early 1930s for colleges and universities to cooperate during the summer in offering courses, in conducting tours, and in the use of facilities. A number of universities and colleges cooperated in offering special courses and activities in the arts, music, and particularly in certain health and science fields.

Summer Session Offerings in the 1960s

By the 1960s summer terms had continuously broadened the scope of both their purposes and offerings to attract new categories of students to supplement the long-term work of providing both pre- and in-service education for teachers. In 1960, data from 1,369 collegiate institutions indicated summer courses were offered in the subject fields listed below by the percentages of institutions shown.[4]

Subject Fields	Percentages	Subject Fields	Percentages
Social Sciences	81	Business/Commerce	49
English & Journalism	80	Philosophy	45
Education	76	Religion	37
Mathematics	70	Geography	32
Fine & Applied Arts	67	Library Science	21
Biological Sciences	66	Engineering	19
Physical Sciences	64	Home Economics	19
Psychology	64	Health Professions	17
Foreign Lang./Lit.	51	Agriculture	9

Small percentages of institutions provided summer work in law, forestry, architecture, and trade and industrial training. Nine of every ten institutions offered undergraduate instruction; about four of every ten offered graduate instruction, and in 26 percent non-degree credit workshops and institutes were offered. Teachers and teacher candidates constituted over one-half of the summer enrollments in 47% of all institutions, but there was variance among different types of colleges and universities.[5] By type of institution the percentages in which education students constituted over one-half the summer term enrollments were: universities 15%, liberal arts colleges 58%, art schools 26%, junior colleges 23%, and teachers colleges 93%. Teachers constituted over one-half the summer enrollments in 23% of the land grant institutions. In 1960, a significant percentage of the summer enrollments were still teachers, but their relative percentages rather than absolute numbers had declined due to the expansion of offerings to other fields and the attraction of new categories of students. A variety of seasonal, interdepartmental, and interdisciplinary programs, workshops, operas, and drama events were offered.

Professional growth needs of such groups as lawyers, dentists, medical doctors, business executives, as well as teachers were met through both credit and non-credit workshops and institutes. Many institutions stressed social and cultural activities, and some offered courses for special groups such as talented high school graduates and seniors. Faculty in some institutions used the summer session to experiment with new courses and activities which, if successful, could be integrated into the regular academic year offerings. Some institutions offered summer work for academically ineligible applicants on a trial basis for freshman year admittance or for regular year students who needed to eliminate deficiencies.

It was clear that, while many institutions treated summer sessions as being detached from the rest of the year educational offerings, a number had come to view summer session as an integral and equal part of the year-round program to accelerate a student's academic process and to increase enrollment capacity. Of the main summer term enrollment, 79.2% were in degree programs, 5.7% pursued work without credit toward a degree, and 15.1% were in institutions that did not keep such records.

Non-Formal Classroom Activities

In an earlier part of this chapter it was related that by the 1930s a number of summer credit and non-credit educational activities besides traditional campus classroom instruction had been developed. Those included study tours, both domestic and foreign, summer camps, summer branches, biological laboratories, outdoor leadership training, programs for special groups, institutes, and conferences. Conspicuous by its absence was reference to work shops; they were not a part of summer-time educational activities until 1936.

Workshops and Institutes. The numbers of summer workshops increased from 40 in 1938 to 106 in 1940 in as many different institutions. By 1960, the number of collegiate institutions sponsoring non-degree workshops had more than tripled to 362, and the number of individual workshops had increased to 1,802, a 1,700% increase. The provision of summer workshops and institutes varied by institutional type and control. Universities held 56% of all summer institutes and workshops which were attended by 70% of all persons registered in such activities during 1960. Liberal arts colleges held 23% of the workshops and institutes and enrolled 17% of the registrants, and teachers colleges held 9% of them and registered 8% of the participants. Public institutions held 64% of all workshops and institutes, and three-fourths of the registrants in all types of colleges attended them.

The emphasis was changing, for whereas in 1940 74% of the workshops and institutes dealt with education topics, by 1960 education topics were the focus for only 59%. Business, professional, and vocational themes accounted for about 17% of the workshops and institutes in 1940 and 23% in 1960, but social, cultural, and national affairs themes increased from 9% to 18%.

Critics of the non-credit workshops and institutes offered during the summer questioned their validity as part of higher education but their non- credit status probably quelled complaints of earlier times that many were not academic in content. Not only did workshops and institutes provide knowledge to those who needed it but could not attend regular summer sessions, but they also focused upon changing contemporary issues and concerns.

Travel Study Tours. The summer credit travel courses which had flourished in 1931 continued to be a viable summer offering in 1960, for 247 travel courses were found offered by 192 colleges and universities. By 1960, some colleges or universities had developed campuses in foreign countries and presented a varied curriculum there. Over one-half of the 1987 foreign travel study tours were conducted in Europe. Other study areas included South America, Russia, Middle East, the Orient, Japan, Jamaica, South Pacific, and the Mediterranean area. Around the world study excursions were also conducted. Credits awarded ranged from 2 to 15 in 25 academic fields or combinations of fields including foreign languages, art, and geography and geology. It was clear by 1960, since the number of summer study travel tours had increased nearly three times since the 1930s, that they had become an important aspect of higher education.

Statistical Indices of Summer Session Program Characteristics

For two decades prior to 1960, the percentages of enrollments by institution type had remained relatively stable with the preponderance enrolled in liberal arts colleges and universities, and most were in public institutions. The division by gender had reversed itself as enrolled men surpassed in numbers those of women. Main summer session registration constituted 26.1% of the fall first term enrollments in 1955 and 25.6% in 1960. Evidence about programs indicated summer sessions had been versatile in their offerings and maintained programs leading to not only a bachelor's degree but also the associate, first professional, master's and doctor's degrees. Breadth of offerings rivaled those of other term offerings.

Nearly 27% of the collegiate institutions representing all regions and types offered a second term, and a few (3%) offered a short third term. Second term enrollments were about one-half the number registered in the first main term, and third term registrants equaled about 17% of those in the first term. While second term registrant characteristics were similar to those in first term, those in third term consisted of a higher percentage of advanced graduate students and women.

With little difference between public and private institutions but with some deviations by region and institutional type, nearly eight of every 10 institutions reported that admissions requirements for summer term courses were the same as for other terms during the year. They differed in about two of every ten institutions. Most deviations occurred in the New England and Far Western regions and in universities more than in other collegiate types. One-half of the institutions that altered admission requirements did so to admit transient students regularly enrolled elsewhere. They generally required a certificate of good standing. If such a student wished to enroll in the ensuing fall term, then they were subject to the same entrance standards and procedures as any other student. Twelve percent each indicated they did not require in summer for admission all the usual documentation and testing normally a part of the other term registration process or they admitted special students such as inservice teachers without the usual qualifications but with the understanding such admission would not normally lead to a degree. Eight percent deviated by admitting their own students who had been suspended for substandard other term work if circumstances supported a presumption that such a student could redeem previous failures. Ten percent let borderline applicants who would otherwise probably be refused admission try out their chances for success during the summer period.

In semester-hour credit institutions during summer main term, students averaged 5 to 8 credits in 72% of the colleges and universities and 9 or more credits in 9%. In quarter-hour credit institutions main term summer students averaged 6 to 11 credits in 56% and 12 or more credits in 34%. In semester-hour institutions, when all summer terms were included, slightly more than 21% of the students earned 9 or more credits, and in quarter-hour institutions slightly over 52% of the students averaged 12 or more credits. The average number of credits which students actually took was less than the number which they might have taken if all students enrolled for the maximum number of credits permitted. In 23% of the institutions the credit load permitted and the credit load attempted by students were identical. In the others, some might conclude there had been a wastage of opportunity and institutional efficiency. This gap might be expected to be greater for commuter institutions catering to the needs of part-time students than for residential colleges or universities.

Nearly all collegiate institutions, except some technological and other professional, semi-professional, or theological and religious schools gave full faith and credit for work done in summer toward degree programs for regularly enrolled students. Most institutions, however, generally limit the number of non-residence credits which degree program students can transfer.

In 95% of the universities, liberal arts colleges, and teachers colleges summer classes ranging from 10-19 students existed, and in 91% there were summer classes of less than 10 students. Small classes of 10 or under were more prevalent in universities (97%) than in either liberal arts colleges (91%) or teachers colleges (90%). In 64% of the universities, liberal arts colleges, and teachers colleges, there were summer classes held with 30 to 49 students, but they were most prevalent in the universities (95%) and teachers colleges (82%) and least prevalent in liberal arts colleges (51%). Classes with 50 or more students were found in considerably higher percentages of universities with teachers colleges a distant second and liberal arts colleges last. Only 2% of the liberal arts colleges had classes with 90 to 100 students compared to 4% of the teachers colleges and 25% of the universities.

To service summer session library needs of students in 1960, library hours in 58% of the universities, liberal arts colleges, and teachers colleges were the same as for any other term, shorter in 36%, and longer in 6%. Hours were shorter in a larger proportion of liberal arts colleges than in other types of institutions and longer in a larger proportion of teachers colleges than in other types of institutions. While degree completion rates during summer for the doctorate were nearly identical to completion rates during other terms, the completion rates for master's and other second level professional degrees were nearly double the rates during other terms. The completion rate for the bachelor's degree was about the same as for other terms.

An Era of Expansion

Between 1960 and 1975, the frequency increased markedly with which publications about summer terms/sessions in professional journals appeared. That was a period of rapid growth of collegiate enrollments and the creation of many new institutions to accommodate the growing numbers and proportions of Americans thirsting for higher learning. Most of the information made available in periodicals consisted of testimonials about activities designed to serve special groups or approaches to packaging and delivering educational services in new formats.

Changing Summer Scene

Bloom indicated that, while summer term had not become a formal part of the program by 1965, the increased use of summer for education was a big step toward year-round utilization of schools and colleges. He indicated the predominant reason for popularity of collegiate summer sessions was the prospect of enrichment and of rapid advancement by students with a reduction of time from four to three years to earn a bachelor's degree. He reported that the make-up of summer session had changed from the offering primarily of remedial work and recreational programs and programs directed to other term students who had failed to programs serving regular and special types of students. A number of institutions were reported to be encouraging recent high school graduates to begin college in the summer as a means of accommodating more students. Some encouraged talented and mature high school students to take college courses for credit during the summer between their junior and senior years. Bloom reported that one-fourth of the 1964 freshman class at Pennsylvania State University had begun their college studies during the previous summer. The average summer enrollment at major universities had been estimated at 40% of the fall enrollments.

Colleges began to seek out talented, underprivileged, and/or disadvantaged students for supplementary work during the summer. The program at Mount Holyoke College to expand educational opportunities for talented disadvantaged girls, a precollege enrichment program for 20 Black Mississippi youth, and Outreach programs for underprivileged youth at Princeton, Dartmouth, and the University of Pennsylvania were cited as examples. The era was also a time when teachers and school administrators went back to school in record numbers for advanced courses and special training institutes.[6]

Typical of the enrollment predicament in which numerous universities found themselves during the 1960s was the University of Massachusetts that planned on accepting 4,200 students to obtain a freshman class of 2,600. When 8,000 additional students showed up, plans for their rejection led not only to the establishment of a Boston based campus but also to the development of a plan where qualified applicants on the waiting list could begin their programs during the summer, skip fall enrollment, and enroll again the next spring to fill places created by normal attrition. Using two six week summer terms a special program known as the swing shift accommodated 180 students during the summer who had earned an average of 24.7 semester hours by the end of the spring term with a performance record comparable to regular fall term enrollees. Success of the swing shift program led to its expansion the following year.[7] Thus, improvisation using summer session for accommodating increased enrollment demands took different forms throughout the higher education system as a variety of schemes were developed. Flexible summer scheduling was a strategy for meeting students' needs with convenience. In 1968 the newly organized Richmond Professional Institute offered simultaneously both a 9-week day and evening session, a 6-week session, a 3-week and a 5-week post session, and a 12-week Saturday morning session. In addition to the 450 courses offered, offerings also included two credit European study tours in art, four special workshops in music, three short courses for teachers in Aerospace Education, and three credit travel tours in geography and history. Non-credit continuing education workshops were held for social workers, and graduate courses in Education were cooperatively offered with the University of Richmond.[8] The rapidity of expansion in summer session enrollments in courses, workshops, and institutes at both undergraduate and graduate levels was reflected in a discussion of enrollment expectations at nine Wisconsin public universities.[9] Ambitious plans for summer 8-week sessions at 10 Wisconsin state university campuses for the 1970 summer were announced including European tours, sessions in Monterrey and Mexico City, and a geological field study trip to Iceland.[10] While collegiate institutions sought ways to accommodate more on-campus students through greater utilization of summer period programs, they were also busy continuing and expanding upon various special interest and special purpose activities.

Special Purpose Activities for Special Groups

The tenor of the times is often revealed by the matters of concern which are alluded to in professional publications about program activities. With few exceptions, when attention was given to marketing and publicizing summer programs, most published topics about summer session between 1960 and 1975 focused on serving special groups. Some collegiate institutions became concerned about reaching down into the high schools to encourage disadvantaged and underprivileged but talented youth to raise their sights and ambitions to include college education.

Outreach for Minority and Disadvantaged Persons

Aligned to these goals were the summer program efforts reported at the State University of New York at Potsdam. Summer programs were developed for bright high school youth including economically and socially-culturally depressed girls from Brooklyn as well as other non-elite underprivileged students with low levels of aspiration.[11] A variety of summer compensatory preparatory programs offered by colleges, universities, and some foundations designed to further the academic success of socially disadvantaged youth were described based on more than seven dozen references.[12] A 6-week summer session cooperative program offered by a consortium of colleges and universities in New York City to assist 2,000 to 3,000 9th and 10th grade students, mostly Black and Puerto Rican, prepare to enter college was described.[13] Various higher education strategies, including summer institutes providing bilingual classes for incoming freshmen were discussed at a conference on increasing opportunities for Mexican American students.[14] Lists of summer work and travel projects relative to college and vocational training open to Blacks were made available in North Carolina.[15]

Not all the summer efforts to assist ethnic minority people met with full success in the opinion of at least one author. Harvard, Yale, and Columbia Universities collaborated in developing an Intensive Summer Studies Program (ISSP) to provide a pre-graduate school experience for Black students from predominately Black colleges.[16] The effort as supported financially by the Carnegie, Ford, and Sloan Foundations and designed to attract Black students to graduate studies with a scholarship, spending money, and transportation provided for attendance. Among other things cited in the harsh criticism of the ISSP effort was the lack of Black faculty in the program and lack of Black involvement in the planning for the events. Federally funded institutes were held in South Carolina for participants representing seven colleges and universities for home economics teachers of the disadvantaged, and another was held for native Spanish teachers of Spanish.[17]

Institutes for Special Groups

Many summer language institutes were sponsored on college and university campuses under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Evaluations of such institutes held at 80 institutions were summarized at a 1963 NDEA meeting.[18] Also evaluated were 20 summer institute programs sponsored by the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board, and recommendations for future summer institutes were made.[19] Summer institutes at the Universities of Florida and Massachusetts and at Arcachon, France were described. These institutes utilized parts of the French Audiolingual Language Program (ALLP) with the goals being near native pronunciation and intonation habits and command of basic speech patterns.[20] An evaluation of summer civics institutes held at five institutions for a total of 190 public school teachers was also reported.[21]

Examples of institutes held for teachers included one for prospective supervising public school teachers in Kentucky. The supervising teachers cooperated in the college and university student teaching programs, and the institute was designed to provide them with a human relations experience in an interracial setting to cope with problems emanating from the desegregation of public schools.[22] A 6-week summer institute cooperatively held by Dollard, Loyla, Tulane, and Xavier Universities and St. Mary's Dominican College was aimed at providing participants with skills needed to help student and beginning teachers perform successfully in four racially mixed schools.[23]

Particular advantages were revealed of intensive summer language courses enabling students to do a years' academic work in a summer session and conducted at 22 American colleges and universities. These sessions resulted from a survey undertaken by the Foreign Service Institute with assistance from the Universities of Michigan and Pennsylvania.[24] An evaluation was reported of a 4-year cooperative foreign language program undertaken by 10 Midwestern colleges to improve teaching and curricular practices for foreign language majors and teaching majors. A major component consisted of summer faculty workshops held for coordination and implementation purposes.[25] Summer educational activities sponsored throughout the country in Mexico for teachers of Latin American students were described.[26]

Many summer institutes were spawned by financial support made available through the National Science Foundation. The extent of this effort was reflected by a listing of 276 institutes held during one summer in the early 1970s for secondary school teachers of science, mathematics, and social sciences.[27] Listed summer courses, programs, and workshops in 36 states and Canada for earth science teachers revealed one evidence of emphasis placed on science during the summer sessions.[28]

Summer institutes were held by Temple University, Hunter College, and San Francisco State University to help teachers of business subjects in urban settings to increase their knowledge about disadvantaged culturally different youth and to implement teaching units for such programs.[29] Critical issues in vocational and technical education and their implications for teacher preparation programs in small colleges and universities provided the focus of a 2-week summer institute in North Carolina for teachers and administrators.[30] Summer institutes were administered by the Fluid Power Society through Advisory Committees and held in five colleges and universities aimed at teaching fluid power and evolving techniques for introducing new technologies to teachers.[31]

A summer institute designed to investigate manpower research needs for the 1970s and to explore the purposes of manpower research centers was conducted at the University of Iowa.[32] A major summer effort was described involving approximately 1,100 students from 50 New York City area colleges and universities who worked in more than four dozen agencies in a million dollar program funded jointly by the College Work-Study Program of the Office of Education and the city.[33] This effort was sponsored by the Sloan and Rockefeller Foundations and the Twentieth Century Fund. In Maine, a series of summer institutes sponsored by the State Department of Education and the University of Maine at selected university locations were held for employed or prospective teacher aides.[34]

Inter-institutional cooperative summer efforts have taken different forms. The evaluation of one experimental cooperative effort to organize summer session activities was reported between the California State University at Chico and two community colleges.[35] As part of a 13-college curriculum program involving predominately Black colleges and the Institute for Services to Education, an 8-week summer conference became one of the important components.[36]

A summer institute designed to emphasize the importance and content of Black humanities and to promote curricular changes was held for teachers of eight predominately Black colleges in Alabama at Miles College.[37] Information on summer institutes in linguistics as well as programs in 167 institutions offering five or more courses in the field was made available.[38] A model curriculum was described for a complete summer school in Murano, Italy for the teaching of glass as an art material at the college level.[39] A summer school for Andragogues at an advanced degree level and located in the seashore town of Porec, Yugoslavia was described. This summer session activity was designed to help adult educators become more effective.[40]

Many institutional specific reports were published on summer teacher inservice institutes and workshops held throughout the period. They ranged from emphasis on nearly every subject taught in the public schools to such special interest topics as behavior management, creativity and problem solving, drug abuse, skill shops in horticulture, character education, recreational planning, dental health, early childhood, and learning disabilities. From an examination of the efforts reported above, it is clear that many summer activities were encouraged by funds made available to induce attention as would be in the national policy interest to such educational thrusts as emphasis on science, providing assistance and opportunity to disadvantaged and under privileged groups, communication in a multi-lingual world, and the integration and accommodation of culturally mixed citizens in the educational system and society. The proclivity of educators to acquire funds for whatever purpose from wherever they become available to implement activities, especially in summer terms, to foster special interest objectives, including national priorities has been clearly reflected. Major educational foundations espoused causes in line with some of the priorities and resulted in some university efforts being handsomely supported by them.

Summer Sessions Since 1975

The types of non-formal classroom educational activities such as work shops, institutes, study tours, clinics, and conferences which flourished in the 1960s and early 1970s, with the exception of some funded by federal monies, continued into the 1980s. To these were added several different emphases and types of summer activities. This section is devoted to a description of some innovations and changes in emphases as revealed by a review of the publications which appeared.

Disadvantaged and Gifted

Concern continued about serving low income, underrepresented, minority, and disadvantaged students.[41] After 1975 increasing amounts of material appeared regarding summer programs for the talented and gifted. Programs and projects receiving outside financial support, including a summer upward bound residential program at the General College University of Minnesota were described as was a summer program entitled College for Kids at the University of Wisconsin. The latter won the 1981 National Association for Summer Sessions Award for the most creative and innovative program offered by a college or university in North America.[42] A cooperative university-high school project for gifted high school students entering their senior year was described in which students not only had opportunity to earn six quarter hours of credit but could assist also a campus scientist with their research efforts.[43] An on-going summer collaborative program between the University of South Carolina and a county school district to provide accelerated and enriching learning experiences, with a component for teachers of gifted children, was described as a promising approach.[44] A continuing summer residential program operated at Duke University for precocious youth from a 16 state region was described as having been patterned after a talent search program at Johns Hopkins University.[45] Similar regional talent search programs existed at the University of Arizona, Northwestern University, and the University of Denver. Each of the universities offered a summer program for talented youth.

Elderhostel

One of the newest types of summer educational activities is the one-week college-level courses offered on college campuses known as Elderhostel. The movement, primarily designed to serve persons over age 60, began as an experimental effort in 1975 by five New Hampshire colleges. From this meager beginning a national network now exists. By 1980 there were Elderhostel programs held in all 50 states, and the number had increased from 5 serving 20 participants to 30 serving over 20,000 participants. Nationally, Elderhostel has been incorporated as a nonprofit educational program with headquarters in Boston. There is little centralized control, and each state has its own director who plans with participating colleges and universities. Enrollees range from persons who never attended high school to those with advanced degrees, and they represent all economic strata. Funding was made available under Title I of the Higher Education Act and there have been local sponsors such as the Telephone Company, Arts Council, organizations interested in the humanities, and various foundations. The movement has spread to Canada, Great Britain, and Scandanavia, and in 1986, 120,000 senior citizens were expected to enroll worldwide. An all inclusive relatively small fee includes registration costs, six nights of accommodations (usually in college dormitories close to classrooms), five days of classes and a variety of extra-curricular activities. A small percentage goes to the national office from which hostelships (scholarships) are available to aspiring participants who can't afford the program cost.

A wide range of courses in the liberal arts and sciences are offered, and regional courses have been particularly popular. Such courses as Allegheny crafts, genius of southern literature, or Rocky Mountain flora and fauna would be examples. Courses have included creative writing, history, contemporary issues, solar energy, your own life story--write it down, opera, art, and drawing. In 1980 more than 1,600 courses were offered. Major benefits cited by participants have been intellectual stimulation, fellowship, travel, and meeting new people.[46]

Alumni Colleges

An increasingly popular summer educational activity which began in 1964 at Dartmouth College but which has achieved its widespread popularity since 1975 is the alumni college. At Dartmouth the residential program typically runs for eleven days and accommodates about 300 alumni and their spouses.[47] Participants examine what it means to be American in response to social and economic problems such as inflation, world energy and food shortages, and political instability in the Mideast. Weekend alumni seminars are also held on topics ranging from current crises to Renaissance, art, and music. The Cornell University Alumni College offers four week sessions with approximately two dozen courses for as many as 900 participants. The title of the activity was changed from Cornell Alumni College to the Cornell Adult Union. In 1978, Cornell played host to 1,000 adults and 400 children, and Brown University had to return 100 checks to disappointed would-be registrants in excess of those that could be accommodated. Johns Hopkins, the University of Illinois, Pennsylvania State University, Brown University, Ohio Wesleyan, Stanford University, and Cornell University are among the early pioneer institutions that provided alumni colleges.[48]

Other Summer Activities for Senior Citizens

A smorgasbord variety of summer educational activities for mature citizens are flourishing as never before in addition to continuing education programs offered year-round at hundreds of colleges and universities. Besides focusing on solid academic subjects, the summer programs include a kind of business-with-pleasure experience attractive to many persons who would other wise not be interested. Students of all ages participate in the Education Week activity held at Brigham Young University. The variety of appealing summer experiences can be illustrated by the American University sponsored Riding the Rails course which included a 6,450 mile rail trip, a course in The Viability of Covert Operations as a Presidential Modality in Foreign Affairs at Shimer College, or scuba diving off the coast of California offered by the University of Southern California. Goucher College has sent senior summer students by canoe to study ecology in Chesapeake Bay, and Case Western Reserve University has dispatched students to its Square Valleevue Farm to study painting.[49]

Wichita State University developed low-cost residential-educational experiences for persons age 60 or over known as the Senior Scholars Program.[50] In contrast to mostly out-of-state students participating in Elderhostel, Senior Scholars were from Wichita (50%) or small towns in Kansas. Day programs with evening social activities were provided. A small fee covered room and board for five days or a commuter fee and five lunches and a choice of one morning and one afternoon two-hour course. Besides utilization of otherwise vacant residence halls, a major advantage was opportunity for staff to develop their skills by the experience of teaching and working with older adults. There were institutional advantages such as enhanced image, the fostering of intra-institutional cooperation, and such intangibles as enthusiasm and goodwill generated by the program.

Typical age of participants in summer educational activities for mature citizens range from 61 to 95. An account was given of a 95-year-old participant who played tennis daily with his 76-year-old girlfriend during recreational periods.

Major Programs for College Faculty Development

Most of the faculty inservice development summer activities (workshops, institutes, clinics, conferences, etc.) held throughout the decades were for elementary school teachers and teachers of secondary school subjects. In the early 1980s these activities continued, but some began focusing on the improvement of college level faculty. A noteworthy effort of the former type was a summer institute for beginning teachers in non-public schools sponsored for two years by Columbia University. Nearly one-hundred teachers who demonstrated outstanding potential, most of whom lacked any prior professional training, were served through programs designed for them during each of two summers. Evaluations revealed the experience had increased confidence, competence, and commitment of participants.[51]

For the improvement of college faculty, a short-term national experimental college, known as the College I project, was sponsored at Bowdoin College by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC) and funded by the Kellogg Foundation. Faculty and selected students from small liberal arts colleges assembled to form a temporary educational system during a 4-week summer period. New teaching methods, new course designs and content, different modes of student-faculty interaction and evaluation, and alternate assumptions about educational philosophy, values, and practices were explored.[52] Another major effort sponsored by the National Institute of Education was designed to expand the participation and upgrade skills in research and development of faculty from predominately Black colleges and universities. Three 4-week summer residential workshops were held at Howard University focusing on models and methods of social and behavioral sciences, computer utilization in those sciences, and grantsmanship.[53]

Local Community Service

Through year-round continuing educational services activities some colleges and universities have long contributed to meeting certain types of local community needs, especially in metropolitan areas. As the nation enters the information age, the transition from the industrial age of the past may hold a myriad of new opportunities to meet emerging needs for education and training. One such effort was made through a joint project by the Ohio State University and the Columbus public schools to provide for citizens training in microcomputer use. Classes consisting of ten clock hours of instruction were offered over four weeks in 53 different classes in seven broad areas to 10,620 registrants.[54]

Programming Expectations for the 1980s

At the threshold of the 1980s, Rehnke explored with directors of summer sessions holding membership in the North American Association of Summer Sessions (NAASS) their predictions for summer programming throughout the new decade.[55] She found expected general trends would include an increase in summer programs designed for the adult and part-time students, college credit for career experiential education gained either before or as part of a program, and courses offered at off-campus locations and at times convenient to students. Senior citizens were considered a very important group for which to plan, especially on residential campuses. This was also the case for alumni colleges. Foreign and handicapped students were not considered among the most important groups for which to plan. Practical job related summer offerings such as co-operative programs with agencies and businesses and credit internship programs were expected to be in increased demand. A majority of directors expected the popularity of domestic and foreign travel courses to wane, except for institutions located in rural areas and in small towns (under 6,000 population) where foreign travel tours were expected to remain attractive. Generally, either newspaper courses or television course delivery systems were not expected to be popular.

Evening sessions, short intensive sessions concentrating on one subject, shorter three or five week terms rather than longer ones, and four-day weeks were viewed as preferable. They were viewed as a means to flexibly accommodate time frame patterns convenient to students, especially in smaller size institutions. Expected summer program patterns varied by institutional fall enrollment size. Smaller institutions anticipated more than did large ones increased summer program emphases and demand for prior learning credit programs and internships. Institutions with fall enrollments of 15,000 or over preferred traditional 8 or more week sessions and were less concerned about prior learning programs or internships. Evening sessions and newspaper courses were most favored by commuter institutions.

Special Groups Served

Directors of summer terms in four-year colleges and universities of all types revealed that by the mid-1980s a variety of special groups were being served by programs developed especially for them.[56] Information in Table 5 reveal the percentages of institutions programming for each special group. Most four-year collegiate institutions programmed summer term offerings to serve their regular degree program students, part-time students, and teachers needing certificate renewal. The latter group was served by smaller percentages of liberal arts (65%) and research universities (70%) than by doctoral granting (82%) and comprehensive (88%) colleges and universities. Found least were summer programs for handicapped students, advanced placement programs for students age 16-22, ethnic minority groups, and students not meeting other term admissions requirements. Considerably more universities than liberal arts colleges programmed for foreign students, senior citizens, returning women, ethnic minorities, handicapped students, and persons age 16-22 who could benefit from advanced placement.

TABLE 5
PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS BY SPECIAL GROUP SERVED

	Percentages	
Special Group	Universities	Liberal Arts Colleges
Regular degree program students	93	78
Teachers needing certificate renewal	84	65
Part-time students	75	54
Commuter students	60	50
Gifted or accelerated students	53	26
Foreign students	46	11
Senior citizens	40	30
Students not meeting other term admission requirements	36	35
Ethnic minority	35	11
Advanced placement programs for students age 16-22	26	14
Handicapped students	22	3
Other groups	2	5

Regular Summer Session Activities

Besides regular campus classes offered in the traditional mode, use is made in summer term of various other types of delivery systems and more non-traditional educational activities. The extent of their use in the 1980s is shown by information presented in Table 6 for all types of universities and for liberal arts colleges.[57]

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS BY REGULAR SUMMER SESSION ACTIVITY

Regular Summer Session Activities	Percentages Universities	 Liberal Art Colleges
Teaching at off-campus locations	75	33
Foreign travel programs	73	35
Internship programs for credit	73	61
Cooperative programs with bus., ind., or government organizations	64	24
High school camps	53	50
Regional or in-state study-travel tours	47	14
Elderhostel programs	47	34
Alumni programs	18	10
Non-credit internship programs	15	10
Newspaper courses	15	2
Prior learning assessment programs	13	10
Telenet courses	11	5
Other	11	14

Among universities, the most predominant activities were locating summer classes off campus at locations convenient to students, foreign travel study programs, credit internship programs, cooperative programs with business, industry, or government agencies and organizations, and high school camps. Credit internship programs and high school camps were found to be regular summer activities in one-half or more liberal arts colleges, but the other regular summer activities found predominant in universities were not a part of the regular activities in a majority of liberal arts colleges. Domestic regional travel study and elderhostel programs were regular summer activities in significantly more universities than liberal arts colleges. Liberal arts colleges were less inclined than universities to offer any kind of non-traditional regular summer term activity than classroom instruction. Some of the other types of regular summer term activities offered by universities were self-funded workshops, theatre, lecture series, conferences for various professional groups (engineers, lawyers, health science workers, etc.), language institutes, and conferences. Visiting faculty workshops, Shakespeare festival and seminars, field course in Alaska, elementary school summer camps, and cooperative master's degree program with another state university were also regular summer activities identified.

Trends in Regular Academic Program Offerings

The planning for regular degree program students in summer is influenced by many factors. Not the least of these factors are national and societal trends which create changes in demands and interests of students as major fields of specialization are selected. During the period 1978 to 1981, increases in summer enrollments of universities took place in all the science related fields with the greatest increases in engineering and mathematics subjects. Decreases were found among the largest percentages of universities in home economics, health science, and biological sciences. Without exception the largest increases in summer enrollments were in business subjects. In other non-science fields, decreases in summer enrollments had occurred in larger percentages of universities than had increases, with the exception of law. The largest decreases in summer course enrollments were in education, performing arts, and foreign languages with humanities a close runner-up.

By 1985, the largest increases in summer indices of productivity had been in the number of credit hours generated. While nearly three of every ten universities had increased the number of credit hours and courses offered, there was no marked increase generally among universities in either. There had been a marked increase between 1978 and 1981 in number of headcount students enrolled and numbers of students in summer courses. About one-third of the universities expected further increases in both respects during the 1982 to 1984 period, but increases in numbers of headcount students occurred in 45% of the universities and the number of students in classes had occurred in about one-fourth of the institutions. The average number of courses taken by students remained the same between 1982 and 1984 as they had been in the preceding three year period in spite of predictions of increases within at least one-fourth of the universities.

Creativity in Summer Programming

One of the major justifications for collegiate summer sessions throughout the decades has been the opportunity to develop and try out innovative educational programs and practices on an experimental basis. This purpose has long been among those subscribed to by administrators and authors writing about the unique characteristics of summer sessions. Approximately three of every ten universities had programs and/or activities during the 1983 and 1984 summers which they considered to be innovative, unique, exemplary, or experimental. Such activities were reported by public universities of all categories of fall enrollment size, but a significantly larger percentage of private institutions with fall headcount enrollments over 8,000 than smaller ones had such programs.

From summer programs and/or activities listed as being creative (exemplary, unique, experimental, or innovative) by 53 universities, 14 were selected by a panel of knowledgeable persons as having deviated most from typical practice. Site visit interviews were conducted at each university to examine the nature of 36 activities deemed to be creative and to explore the factors which were perceived to have been associated with the development and implementation of such activities.[58] Most (72%) were found to be innovative in that a program and/or activity had been implemented which was new and different in a given institution from the way things were done typically and traditionally. The rest (28%) were unique and/or experimental when judged on the basis of being very rare and uncommon or completely without like or equal anywhere else or when it was in the process of experiential testing, possibly for the purpose of creating or testing a new program model. Four of every ten were substantive in purpose, but most dealt with mechanics of packaging and delivering education. Only 11% of all programs and/or activities identified as creative were truly experimental. Of the substantive programs, one was found unique and experimental, three were experimental, five were unique, and five were innovative. All the programs and activities which dealt with program mechanics were innovative in character.

The most factors deemed to be most important were the internal influences of departmental/division faculty in which the creative program or activity was spawned, initiative of individual faculty members, the summer session director/administrator, and encouragement by central institutional administrators. Next most influential were the external factors of general public concerns, general societal trends, current and potential student interests and demands, and expressions of interest and demand by occupational and occupational groups. While summer faculty grants was an internal factor that ranked high in the judgments of administrators, faculty did not believe this factor was very important. However, faculty thought personal financial incentives were relatively important; academic and summer administrators believed otherwise.

Although the provisions for evaluation were spotty, none were discerned to have an inhibiting influence on creativity, and no association existed between the mode of decision making extant and the incidence of creativity. Seemingly unrelated factors or influences were enrollment size, ecology of location (urban or rural), size of total population in the place of location, or expenditures for credit hour or per person served.

The institutional atmosphere or climate in which the creative activities flourished seemed to be such that it was just as important to try out new programs and practices and for them not to succeed as it was for them to succeed.

Summary

By the 1930s both types of students attracted to collegiate summer sessions and offerings had diversified. Various new curricula and novel curricular ideas that could not be undertaken during other terms were being tried out during summer. Among the novel programs were travel courses, summer session camps, summer branches, biological laboratories, training for outdoor leadership, music and art activities, programs for special groups, institutes, conferences, and various forms of interinstitutional collaboration in the provision of offerings. Thirty years later data became available on both formal and non-formal types of offerings. Among the latter were workshops and institutes and travel study tours, many of them abroad. Baseline information became available in 1960 regarding various operational features and organizational factors related to summer operation.

There was an era of great expansion of summer-time educational programs between 1960 and 1975, and the volume of literature increased markedly on the subject. Use of summer periods helped absorb the heightened influx of numbers and proportions of Americans seeking collegiate education. During this era many kinds of outreach programs for minority and disadvantaged persons and special groups flourished. After 1975, in addition to the array of broadened educational offerings and activities, emphasis focused on programs for the gifted as well as disadvantaged, elderhostel, alumni colleges, and programs for college faculty development and community service. During the late 1970s and early 1980s there was a marked increase in percentages of regular degree students wishing to accelerate their progress through summer study.

Creative program development was found to exist in many institutions and they seemed to be precipitated most by various internal institutional influences and conditions which cultivated creativity.

Chapter 5 -- Endnotes

1. U.S. Office of Education, Summer Educational Opportunities: Novel features of University and College Summer Sessions, by Ella B. Ratcliffe, Pamphlet No. 27 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932).

2. U.S. Office of Education, Educational Directory 1932, Bulletin No. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932).

3. U.S. Office of Education, Summer Educational Opportunities: Novel Features of University and College Summer Sessions, 2ff.

4. U.S. Office of Education, Summer Session Offerings in Institutions of Higher Education, 1960: A Directory, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962).

5. U.S. Office of Education, Summer Sessions in Colleges and Universities of the United States 1960, by Donald F. Warner, et al., Circular No. 700 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963).

6. Arnold M. Bloom, "In the Busy Old Summertime," American School and University 37 (July 1965): 9.

7. William C. Venmon, "'Swing Shift' Freshmen at the University of Massachusetts," College and University 41 (Winter 1965): 217-220.

8. "Innovative Summer Program Continues at RPI," Virginia Journal of Education 61 (May 1968): 37.

9. "State Universities Expand Summer Plans," Wisconsin Journal of Education 101 (March 1969): 13.

10. "Summer Session/70 at Wisconsin State Universities," Wisconsin Journal of Education 102(7) (March 1970): 5-12.

11. Joseph Justman and Deena Teitelbaum, "A Summer Session College Program for the Non-Elite," The Educational Forum 29 (January 1965): 225-234.

12. Doxey A. Wilkerson, Compensatory Practices in Colleges and Universities, Bulletin 2 (2) March 1966 (New York: Yeshiva University, 1966), ERIC, ED 011 908.

13. American Institute for Research in Behavioral Sciences, College Bound Program, New York City: Secondary Program in Compensatory Education 4 (Palo Alto: The Institute, 1969), ERIC, ED 027 367; American Institute for Research in Behavioral Sciences, College Bound Program, New York, N.Y. Model Programs, Compensatory Education Series (Palo Alto: The Institute, 1972), ERIC, ED 068 620.

14. Anna N. Gomez and Anthony J. Vasquez, The Needs of the Chicano on the College Campus (Long Beach: California State College, 1969), ERIC, ED 031 323.

15. Ben Spaulding and Tony Mason, College Opportunities for Southern Negro Students, 2nd Ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1966), ERIC, ED 022 819.

16. William R. Harvey, "Harvard, Yale, Columbia Intensive Summer Studies Program," Teachers College Record 73 (September 1971): 91-106.

17. Mario Saquel-Montalva, Final Report on the EDPA Institute for Advanced Study for Secondary School Native Spanish Teachers of Spanish, June 23, 1969 to August 8, 1969 (Dayton: University of Dayton, 1969), ERIC, ED 038 059; EDPA Summer Institute for Home Economics--Gainful Teachers of the Disadvantaged, Final Report (Orangeburg: South Carolina State College, 1971), ERIC, ED 059 167.

18. Charles L. King, Evaluations of the Summer 1962 Language Institutes (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1963), ERIC, ED 038 052.

19. John C. Garber, An Independent Evaluation of the 1962 Summer Institute Program of the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board, with Recommendations for Future Institutes (Iowa City: University of Iowa, 1963), ERIC, ED 003 424.

20. Theodore H. Mueller and Henri Niedzielski, Programmed Instruction in Teacher Retraining, NDEA Institutes (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1966), ERIC, ED 025 174.

21. Richard R. Longaker and Robert Cleary, Report on Evaluation of Pilot Civics Institutes, NDEA, 1966 (Los Angeles: University of California, 1966), ERIC, ED 012 272.

22. James H. Powell et al., Interim Report of the Institute for Supervisors of Student Teachers on Problems Occasioned by Desegregation of Public Schools, July 6 Through August 12, 1965 (Lexington: College of Education, University of Kentucky, 1965), ERIC, ED 045 742.

23. Glenn Hontz, Special Training Institute on Problems of School Desegregation (New Orleans: Tulane University, 1967), ERIC, ED 027 242.

24. Henry M. Hoenigswald, et al., A Survey of Intensive Programs in the Uncommon Languages, Summer 1962 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1962), ERIC, ED 016 209.

25. Blair B. Steward, et al., Experimental Refining and Strengthening of Undergraduate Foreign Language Curricula with Supporting Research in Teaching Techniques (Chicago: Associated Colleges of the Midwest, 1964), ERIC, ED 003 880.

26. Association of Teachers of Latin American Studies, Newsletter (Brooklyn: The Association, 1973), ERIC, ED 087 649.

27. National Science Foundation, Summer Institutes for Secondary Teachers of Science, Mathematics, and Social Science (Washington, D.C.: The Foundation, 1972), ERIC, ED 059 155.

28. John R. Coash, "Courses, Programs and Workshops for Earth Science Teachers," Journal of Geological Education 22 (May 1974): 116-119.

29. Robert A. Schultheis and Alvin Vaughn, Changing Undergraduate Business Teacher Education Programs to Prepare Teachers for Culturally Different Youth (Columbus: Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, 1968), ERIC, ED 024 837.

30. A. P. Bell, Institute on Critical Issues in Vocational and Technical Teacher Education in Small Colleges and Universities, Center Seminar and Conference Report No. 8 (Raleigh: University of North Carolina, 1967), ERIC, ED 020 425.

31. Theodore Pearce, Summer Institutes on Fluid Power Education for Vocational and Technical Teachers (Thiensville, Wisconsin: Fluid Power Society, 1967), ERIC, ED 016 113.

32. Neil A. Palomba and Edward B. Jakubauskas, Manpower Research in the 1970s (Washington, D.C.: Manpower Administration, Department of Labor, 1971), ERIC, ED 069 910.

33. George Nash and Julian H. Nixon, Response to Challenge: The New York City Urban Corps (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1967), ERIC, ED 031 135.

34. Roger W. Axford, The Teacher Aide . . . An Answer to the Teacher Shortage (Augusta: Maine State Department of Education, 1968), ERIC, ED 043 811.

35. James O. Haehn and Ralph F. Meuter, Student and Faculty Responses to an Experiment in Inter-Institutional Cooperation, Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the California Educational Research Association, November 7, 1974 (San Francisco: The Association, 1974), ERIC, ED 097 070.

36. Institute for Services in Education, Journey Into Discovery. The Thirteen-College Curriculum Program (Washington, D.C.: The Institute, 1969), ERIC, ED 097 844.

37. Doris W. Havice, Report on the Summer Institute on the Teaching of Humanities at Miles College in 1969 (Birmingham: Miles College, 1970), ERIC, ED 068 011.

38. Linguistic Society of America, Guide to Programs in Linguistics: 1974-75 (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, Linguistic Society of America, 1975), ERIC, ED 107 131.

39. Robert Willson, A College-Level Art Curriculum in Glass, (Coral Gables: Miami University, 1968), ERIC, ED 023 355.

40. Jindra Kulich, "The Summer School at Porec," Adult Leadership 19 (September 1970):83-84.

41. Clem Fiori and Earl P. Thomas, An Outline of the Goals, Objectives, and Activities of the Princeton Cooperative School Program (Princeton: Princeton University, 1976), ERIC, ED 144 430; Luciano Martinez, University of Utah Summer Health Science Program 1977 (Salt Lake City: Ethnic Minority Student Health Science Center, University of Utah, 1977), ERIC ED 149 946; Joseph A. Robustelli and Walter R. Dirl, "Summer Youth Program," Educational Horizons 56 (Spring 1978): 130-136; Earl V. Farrow, Special Programs at Livingston College: Assessment I, 1977-80 (New Brunswick: Rutgers University, 1980), ERIC, ED 213 360; Kenneth Mares, et al., Description and Evaluation of the 1980 Summer Scholars Program (Columbia, MO: The University of Missouri, 1980), ERIC, ED 201 259; Calvin B. Campbell, "Supportive Services Program for Students with Predicted Low Academic Abilities: A Coordinated Approach," Journal of College Student Personnel 22 (September 1981):453-454; Benny Hall, "College Warm-Up: Easing the Transition to College," Journal of College Student Personnel 23 (May 1982): 280-281.

42. Bruce Hixson, ed., General College Programs and Projects Receiving Outside Financial Support (Minneapolis: General College, University of Minnesota, 1982), ERIC, ED 220 007; Ellen E. Notar and Robin Deutsch, "Wisconsin College for Kids Stresses Active, Independent Learning," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 225-226.

43. L. W. Glass, "A Cooperative University-High School Project for Talented Students," The Gifted Child Quarterly 23 (Fall 1979): 532-537.

44. John D. Mulhern and Robert C. Morris, A Field Practicum for Teachers of Gifted Children: The South Carolina Experience (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1982), ERIC, ED 213 661.

45. Robert N. Sawyer, "The Duke University Educational Programs for Brilliant Youths," Roeper Review 7 (November 1984):103-109; Peggy Douglas, et al., Developing Pre-College Programs for High Ability Secondary Students at the University Level, Revision of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association (Tucson, Arizona, November, 1983), ERIC, ED 254 141.

46. Ron Chepesiuk, "Elderhostel: An Education Program for the Times," The Elks Magazine 65 (September 1986): 4-5; 10; 37-38; Peggy Houston, Iowa Elderhostel (Iowa City: The University of Iowa, 1980), ERIC, ED 194 766; Max Kaplan, "Elderhostel: Using a Lifetime of Learning and Experience," Change 13 (January/February 1981): 38-41; Zoe Ingalls, "We're Not Dead Yet," The Chronicle of Higher Education 20 (21 July 1980): 3-4.

47. "Alumni Colleges Increase Educational Activities," Times Educational Supplement 7 March 1980, 5.

48. Robert Kanigel, "Alumni Colleges: No Vacation from Learning," Change 11(3) (April 1979): 21-24.

49. Lynn Langway and Dan Shapiro, "Learning Vacations," Newsweek 21 August 1978, 47.

50. Robert M. Pitman, "A Nontraditional Summer Program for the Urban University," Journal of College Student Personnel 23 (January 1982): 87-89.

51. Pearl R. Kane, A Teacher Institute for Beginning Teachers, Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, April 1984), 23-27, ERIC, ED 242 696.

52. William H. Berquist, et al., The College I Experience: Integrating Work, Leisure, and Service (Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1980), ERIC, ED 184 387.

53. Mental Health Research and Development Center, Institute for Urban Affairs and Research, Faculty Research Development Workshop (Washington, D.C.: Howard University, 1982), ERIC, ED 230 125.

54. Nancy J. Kadunc and Gary E. Thompson, Evaluating Summer Tech '83: A Program to Meet the Microcomputer Needs of the Community, Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association (New Orleans, April 1984), 23-27, ERIC, ED 244 596.

55. Mary A. Rehnke, Programming for Summer Sessions in the 1980s, Paper presented at the North American Association of Summer Sessions Conference, (Las Vegas, November 1979), ERIC, ED 181 827.

56. Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall, Relationships of Selected Factors to Summer Session Organizational Structure (Calgary: The University of Calgary, Continuing Education Faculty, 1982), ERIC, ED 235 734; John E. Miller, "Factors Associated with Summer Sessions in Selected United States Private and Public Liberal Arts Colleges" (Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University, 1989).

57. Ibid.

58. Raymond J. Young, "Factors Associated with Creativity: Educational Programming for Summer Terms," Continuing Higher Education Review 53(1) (Spring 1989): 11-34.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMER TERM STUDENTS

Introduction

The characteristics, motivations, and purposes of students who enroll in collegiate summer term academic programs are the topics discussed in this chapter. Historically, the trend regarding the types of students attracted and served can be likened to an inverted pyramid or upright funnel with teachers at the bottom almost exclusively at the beginning. Prior to the 1930s, the percentages of growth in summer enrollment, which was higher than the percentages of enrollment growth during other parts of the year, were due to the changed conditions and requirements surrounding the life of the nation's teachers. Teachers furnished the largest and most important part of the clientele of any and all collegiate summer programs. Over the past half-century, although teachers have continued to be an important segment of summer term enrollments, other types of students became attracted and were embraced within the total program of summer offerings, thus expanding greatly the functions of summer terms. This expansion has led to considerable diversification as represented by the top area of a funnel or the bottom surface of an inverted pyramid. Two decades ago Schoenfeld and Zillman vividly described the nature of summer enrollments when they said, "The kaleidoscopic nature of the summer campus presents both a tremendous challenge to and an important opportunity for American system of higher education."[1] Since that time, the proportional mix of students has changed, but the diversity has continued to increase.

As early as 1931-32, cognizance was taken of two other groups, regular college students and general students mostly of adult years. Regular college students could be categorized into two distinct groups. A lame duck group consisted of those who sought to remove academic conditions or to make up for lost credits. The other group consisted of top-of-the-class students seeking to accelerate their progress by gaining during the summer some of the credits needed for a degree. Since the lame ducks had to do good work or perish, and the others naturally did good work anyway, instructors at the time perceived that all three groups did more serious work and covered more ground than was the case with corresponding groups in other terms. Teachers, then, found themselves in good company and continued to attend summer sessions in numbers increasing annually more than either of the other groups.[2]

Most of the information contained within this chapter will be limited necessarily to summer term students enrolled for academic credit, for it is that group about which most information is available.

Descriptions of Summer Students to 1960

Among major universities conducting studies of summer students, the University of Minnesota was an early leader. Prior to 1935, little, if any, data were available concerning summer students as most studies of students had been confined to those in attendance during other terms of the year. A study of the records of 480 then recent College of Education baccalaurate graduates at the University of Minnesota revealed that 41% had taken part of their bachelor's degree work during summer sessions. This finding contradicted the prevailing perception of faculty that summer study was primarily for graduate students and employed elementary school teachers wishing to complete programs begun in a teacher's college or normal school or a bachelors degree. A 1935 study of all students attending summer session revealed, however, that only 10% of the summer students had been in a collegiate institution the preceding year, and that 87% had been employed during other terms of the year. These findings suggested that a relatively large proportion of undergraduate academic work was taken in fields other than education, and this suspicion was substantiated by an analysis of all summer work taken by the 480 graduates whose records were analyzed. About 6 of every 10 credits earned in the summer had been in fields other than education, and 4 of every 10 had been in education. Data analysis revealed also that, of the credits earned for a bachelors degree, 24% had been earned elsewhere, 13% had been completed during summer sessions by those attending summer session, and the summer session credits represented about 7% of work taken by all students, regardless of whether they had attended summer session. Further analysis revealed that, of the students completing academic credits during the summer, slightly less than 1% were taken to remove a failure incurred during another term; slightly more than 1% were taken to raise a low, but passing grade. The others, 98%, had enrolled to take advanced or new courses.[3] This finding dispelled the impression that summer term students were generally inferior academically to other term students.

By 1955 total summer enrollments in the continental United States consisted of 54.6% men and 45.4% women in comparison to the 52.2% - 47.8% split in 1953. Also 61.2% of the total college summer enrollments were in public institutions compared to 60% in 1953. Resident degree credit summer enrollments in 1955 in public institutions represented 56.6% of similar enrollments in all institutions; the difference of 4.6% reflected summer enrollments in extension and other off-campus arrangements. Men represented 53.2% of the 1955 resident summer enrollments. Summer 1955 resident credit enrollments were 26.5% of the ensuing fall term enrollments for all institutions, but percentages ranged from 25.5% for private to 27.3% for public institutions.[4]

A later study of summer students substantiated the fact that, at the University of Minnesota, students were more mature than those attending during other terms. Nearly 60% had been enrolled there the previous year, 47% on a full-time basis, and only 8% had been enrolled elsewhere. Besides regular students, the next numerical size group were teachers and school administrators. Teachers represented 25% of all summer students, school administrators 3%, and college and university personnel 5%. Only 6% were from an occupation other than teaching.[5]

Responses to the first comprehensive national study of summer sessions revealed that of the 960,994 students attending the 1960 main summer session term in 1,326 collegiate institutions, 89.4% were in four-year institutions and 10.6% were in junior colleges, technical institutes and semi-professional schools. Of the 1,051 four-year colleges and universities, 13% were universities, and they enrolled 46% of the summer term enrollments in four-year institutions. Nearly one-third of the enrollment (32%) was in liberal arts colleges; 17% was in teachers colleges, and 5% was in other types of four-year colleges. About 80% of the students in four-year institutions were enrolled in degree credit courses compared to 77% in two-year colleges. Fifteen percent of the students in both two and four-year colleges and universities were not classified, while 8% and 5%, respectively, were enrolled in non-degree credit courses. Women constituted 46% of the degree credit enrollments in four-year institutions and 40% in two-year colleges. Of all degree credit enrollments, men represented 65% in universities, 44% in liberal arts colleges, 43% in teachers colleges and 84% in other colleges. Until World War II, there had been more women than men, often twice as many enrolled in summer sessions, but during the years afterwards until 1960, total numbers of men outnumbered women. Women constituted 58% of the degree credit enrollment in 1939 and only 46% in 1960. However, in teacher's colleges and liberal arts colleges, the trend of the past lingered on in 1960 as women continued to outnumber men enrolled in them.

The distribution of summer term enrollments between public and private institutions was fairly stable between 1939 and 1960. In the former year, 63% of the main term summer enrollments was in public institutions, and in 1960, public enrollment was 64%. Summer main term enrollments represented 25.6% of the ensuing 1960 fall term enrollments in all institutions. This percentage fluctuated slightly each year.

Level of Work

An analysis of the summer enrollment by level of work indicated that graduate students (first professional, master's and doctor's degrees) constituted 28.6% of the total summer enrollments in universities, 27.7% in teacher's colleges, 13.3% in liberal arts colleges, and 16.6% in other colleges such as technological, theological and religious schools, art schools, and a few other types. Men constituted 66% of the graduate summer enrollments in universities, 53% in teacher's colleges, 48% in liberal arts colleges, and 88% in other types of four-year colleges. Except for liberal arts colleges, men were predominant in graduate programs during summer. Men constituted 59% of the summer session students in two-year colleges working for an associate degree. Except for art schools, other four-year colleges and universities offered the associate degree, and 3% of all students enrolled in four-year institutions were taking courses toward that degree.[6]

Reasons for Summer Attendance

Probes into the reasons for summer attendance revealed that other term students enrolled to get a head start on the next year's work and shorten the time to complete a degree or to make up work missed during the other terms. Other reasons given were that students liked the summer session atmosphere; they believed they learned more in smaller classes, found courses more interesting, and thought a higher intellectual level prevailed. Other students wanted to take courses in an institution other than the one they attended during other terms. Completion of a degree program and professional advancement were reasons teachers gave for summer attendance. Many of both teachers and members of other occupational groups indicated they wanted to enrich their professional backgrounds by further study and to qualify for job advancement. Over 70% of the educators gave personal considerations as a reason for summer attendance compared to 41% of the regular college students and 47% of the non-educational occupations group. Some of the foremost personal considerations included being able to live at home while attending summer session, meeting new people, making new friends, and taking courses to satisfy purely personal interests.[7]

Thirty possible reasons for summer session attendance, categorized into educational program, professional advancement, and personal reasons, were submitted to a ten percent sample of 1980 summer session students.[8] Based on 1,255 usable returns, the reasons identified with the greatest incidence of response were:

1.	To take courses that I was not able to schedule in the regular academic year.	47.6	(3)
2.	To make up prerequisite courses essential to my major program.	34.3%	(2)
3.	To complete credits for graduation requirements before the next academic quarter.	32.0%	(1)
4.	To enrich my professional background by further studies.	22.8%	

5. Other educational program reasons.	18.3%	(4)
6. To take courses for purely personal interest.	16.2%	

Shown in parentheses are the rank order of reasons deemed by students to be their single most important reason for attending summer session. The four top ranked single most important reasons counted for 63.8% of the most important reasons selected. Of the students selecting other educational program reasons, 4.6% indicated their courses were required by their program of study, 2.2% were just continuing to work on a degree, 2.6% wanted to speed up their graduation, and the other 8.9% had a variety of other program related reasons. Eighty-seven percent expressed satisfaction with their experience. Student responses indicated they liked the relaxed atmosphere, the smaller summer classes, and the uncrowded campus during the summer period.

The most frequently identified reasons for not attending expressed by students who had previously indicated an interest, but did not enroll, were: paid employment (61.6%), needed a break from school (49.3%), difficulty in scheduling (25.3%), cost was too great (21.2%), and courses needed weren't offered (20.5).[9] The first and second ranked most single important reasons for non-attendance were the same as the order of listing.

Shown in Table 7 are the reasons students gave for attending the 1986 summer session at the University of Virginia by rank order and by student classification.[10]

Different classifications of students gave greater importance to the reasons for attendance. Approximately 10% of all students indicated a variety of reasons other than those shown. Percentages of respondents are shown in parentheses for the top three reasons for each group to give the reader an idea of the incidence with which they were selected.

Student inquiries concerning reasons for summer session attendance at the University of Wisconsin Madison campus in 1961 and 1981 revealed that the primary reason was to accelerate educational progress.[11] The percentage identifying this reason in 1961 was 39.1%, but in 1981, it was stated by 53.7% of the students. The second most frequent response of "other reasons" was cited by 21.8% in 1961 and 18.1% in 1981. The reason of third order of selection was to complete a degree part-time. While program acceleration was the single most important reason at all levels of student academic classification, it appeared to become less important as students moved to higher grade levels. Personal interest was a major reason given by special students, and part-time study was an important reason for summer attendance by graduate students. The reason of making up courses was of minor importance in 1961, and in 1981 only 1.4% chose it as a reason for attendance. Reasons other than those mentioned, such as troubles with other term course schedules, campus setting, and staff teaching a course increased as grade level increased ranging from 12% for lower division students to 26% for graduates and 24% for special students.

TABLE 7
RANK-ORDER OF REASONS FOR SUMMER ATTENDANCE BY STUDENT CLASSIFICATION

	Rank Order of Reasons			
Reason for Summer Attendance	Under-Graduate	Graduate	Unclassified Undergraduate	Visiting Graduate
Catch up on courses not taken during regular year.	1(30.7%)	5.5	3 (13.2%)	5.5
To be able to take a lighter load in the fall.	2(16.9%)	7	5	5.5
Enrichment and enjoyment.	3(13.2%)	5.5	1(35.3%)	3(6.9%)
Increase grade point average.	4	10	6	9.5
Meet transfer admissions requirements.	5	8	8	5.5
Requirement due to suspension or probation.	6	10	10	9.5
To speed up program to graduate early.	7	2(15.7%)	4	5.5
Professional development.	8	4	2(14.7%)	2(37.5%)
Certification requirement.	9	3(11.9%)	7	1(45.8%)
Could not find a job.	10	10	10	9.5
To do research on dissertation or thesis.	11	1(37.5%)	10	9.5
Number of students.	924	87	68	13

A study of students not planning to attend summer session in 1982 revealed that "personal" and "other" reasons accounted for 51.3% of the primary reasons for not planning to attend. Tuition costs represented a reason for about 10%, and schedule problems were identified by about 21%.

From a study of reasons why graduate and undergraduate students enrolled in each of four summer terms at Miami University, Keller concluded that academic reasons overshadowed environmental reasons (smaller classes, less crowded campus, work with a particular professor, and the like). His study included responses from a 20% random sample of 1,261 students with a 59% response rate, or 738 summer students. Two-thirds of the students had been enrolled full-time the previous year, and reasons given for summer attendance corroborated those found in other studies. Based on reasons for student summer attendance, Keller advised stressing economic advantages and sufficient regular course offerings as points to be emphasized by summer administrators in marketing summer-time programs.[12]

Relationships of Summer and Fall Term Enrollments

The level of educational service provided by a college or university during the summer term has historically been expressed as a percentage which summer headcount or full-time equivalent enrollment is of the ensuing fall term headcount or full-time equivalent enrollment. It may have been noted already that, up to 1960, summer session headcount enrollments had been approximately one-fourth as large as the ensuing fall headcount enrollment with some fluctuation around that level.

The level of service for summer session reflects a number of variables and can be subject to purposeful manipulation. Some of the important variables include the extent to which an institution, often because of its geographical and environmental location, seeks to attract visiting students-- students pursuing degree credit work at another institution during other terms of the year. Another variable is the extent to which special summer offerings are developed, oftentimes featuring outstanding visiting staff from elsewhere as well as regular staff, to attract not only regular degree but also other types of students. Summer term enrollments also reflect the role and mission of the summer session in relationship to the institution's mission and in relation to the institution's work during other terms as perceived by the central administration and governing board. The nature of the academic calendar and coercive or incentive methods employed to attract students also affects summer enrollments.

Experience of the Florida State University system in attempting to manipulate summer enrollments is worth noting. A substantial increase in emphasis on the summer term resulted after the calendar was changed from semesters to a trimester system in 1962. Total summer undergraduate enrollment increased from 31% to 48% of the ensuing fall term enrollment in the three original universities. In 1967, the state university system changed from a trimester to a quarter calendar, and by 1974 the Legislature began funding on a 4-quarter-average enrollment basis, thus assuming equal instructional productivity during all four quarters. Since graduate summer enrollment had been approximately 85% of the ensuing fall graduate enrollments, officials focused upon increasing the undergraduate summer enrollments using both coercive and incentive approaches. In 1976, a plan was implemented to require that students with fewer than 90 quarter hours (60 semester hours) would be required to earn at least 15 quarter hours before graduation during the summer. The next year a summer term enrollment incentive was implemented until 1981. Fees for all summer term undergraduates were reduced 40% for lower division courses and 36% for upper division courses. Some universities admitted students into the summer term who had been turned down for the fall. One university reduced summer dormitory rates, and when students didn't respond, regular rates were restored the next year. Another university initiative was to direct students to off-campus housing where summer rates were reduced. All universities attempted during the summer quarter to offer a full range of courses. The overall effect was that the summer headcount enrollment increased from 54.4% of the ensuing fall enrollment in 1976 to 57.8% in 1980; full time equivalent enrollment increased from 44.7% to 48.3%, about the same magnitude of increment. The summer/fall ratios were found to behave differently for lower division (freshman and sophomore), upper division (junior and senior), and graduate level enrollments. That full-time equivalent summer/fall lower division ratios increased from 0.195 in 1973 to 0.301 in 1980 accompanied by upper division ratios of 0.417 and 0.516, respectively, illustrates this phenomenon. Graduate level ratios decreased from 0.851 to 0.721 which perhaps reflected a decrease in older upper division students which was a trend in that collegiate system during the period.

Extent of summer offerings would seem important in encouraging summer enrollments, and outside of some critical mass range of offerings, a reduction in number of courses would discourage enrollment. Although in the Florida State Universities the average section size between summer and fall varied from 3% to 27% among universities, no relationship was discerned between those differences and the summer/fall ratios. Neither were there important differences in the summer/fall ratios related to whether headcount or full-time-equivalent enrollments were used.[13] Even though there was some positive change in summer/fall ratios in Florida institutions due to incentive and coercive measures taken, based on experience there as well as elsewhere, one could generalize that students simply do not want to attend during the summer period. Student propensity to enroll in summer sessions depends on student and university characteristics which are not subject to external incentives, at least over relatively short periods of time.

Summer/fall full-time equivalent ratios of public universities in eleven southern states were reported to range in 1977 from 0.452 down to 0.203. With no special incentives for summer enrollment, the ratio in Georgia's public university system in 1977 was 0.448, compared to a 1976 ratio of 0.414.[14] The ratio of summer registrations during 1977 in the Pennsylvania institutions of higher education was 0.441 of the ensuing fall total enrollments, and in 1983 the ratio was 0.446.[15] These data demonstrate the variability among institutions in different parts of the country for which data are available concerning levels of service provided by summer sessions.

The second joint statistical report of the four major summer sessions associations revealed that among 244 collegiate institutions in 1977, the mean summer headcount enrollment was 42.5% of the ensuing fall headcount enrollments; the public summer/fall ratio was 0.42 compared to 0.43 for private institutions. In the public institutions 59% and 25%, respectively, of the 1977 summer enrollments were of regular undergraduate and graduate students; 11% and 5%, respectively, were visiting undergraduate and graduate students. In the private colleges and universities, 68% of the summer enrollments were of regular students, while nearly one-third (32%) were visiting students, both undergraduate (20%) and graduate (12%).16 Forty-eight percent of the institutions responding were public.

The most representative recent information about college and university summer term service levels is contained in successive year joint statistical reports issued by the four major summer sessions associations.[17] These data are fraught with limitations, however, for they are derived from responses which have seldom exceeded 45% of the institutions contacted; for most years the response rate has been less than 40%. While public four-year colleges and universities constitute about three-fourths of all four-year institutions, they have not been proportionately represented among the institutions responding to the call for information. For example, percentages of public institutions submitting information for the year 1982, 1983, and 1984 were 52.0%, 53.7% and 54.5%, respectively. So, data are biased by both a disproportionate response from private institutions and a low volunteer response level. In addition, the combined membership to which inquiries were sent represents only about 24% of all four-year institutions in the United States. With these limitations in mind, one can see from Table 8 the service levels for summer terms of reporting member institutions for the years 1977 to 1984.

TABLE 8

RATIO OF SUMMER TO FALL ENROLLMENTS FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES 1977-1984

Year	Total Number of Institutions Responding	Ratio Summer/Fall	
		Public	Private
1977	244	0.52	0.43
1978	---	----	----
1979	166	0.37	0.39
1980	205	0.39	0.42
1981	199	0.38	0.38
1982	218	0.38	0.44
1983	229	0.38	0.32
1984	231	0.38	0.32
1985	218	N/A	N/A

As can be observed, there has been more fluctuation among private than public institutions in summer/fall enrollment ratios. Ratios among public institutions have been reasonably stable and lower since 1977 than for that year.

Summer Session Students In Selected Institutions

In this section are presented data about characteristics of summer term students from selected institutions. Fourteen institutions deemed by the author most likely to have information on summer term students were contacted. The intent is to present snapshots of several typical institutions so the reader will have a clearer picture of the present day situation.

Washington State University

An examination of summer session headcount enrollments at five-year intervals over the last 50 years for Washington State University reveals a general trend in total summer enrollments and the gender mix of students. Data presented in Table 9 obscure the full extent of trends evident from a display of annual data. During the latter part of the national economic depression years of 1935-36 to 1937-38, the proportion of women was greatest, but from 1938-39 until the early World War II years of 1941-42 men outnumbered women. Then from 1942-43 until 1946-47 when veterans returned, women again outnumbered the men. Men have been a predominant majority ever since having reached an all time peak of 73% during the 1948-49 and 1949-50 summer sessions. During the decade ending in 1985-86, the percentage of men was 58.9%.

TABLE 9

FIFTY YEARS OF SUMMER SESSION CREDIT ENROLLMENT WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY[a]

Year	Headcount Enrollment	Percent Men	Year	Headcount Enrollment	Percent Men
1935-36	650	47	1965-66	2,418	64
1940-41	874	63	1970-71	3,223	65
1945-46	757	43	1975-76	3,352	60
1950-51	1,493	72	1980-81	4,142	59
1955-56	1,087	57	1985-86	3,656	58
1960-61	1,452	63			

[a] Office of Summer Sessions, Washington State University. Pullman, WA, February 1986.

It is difficult to get valid data nationally for comparative purposes to determine how characteristics of summer session students in a specific institution may be similar to or different from the general picture. In 1955, while the percentage of men nationally was 53.2%, it was 57% at Washington State University.[18] In 1960, men constituted 54% of summer enrollments nationally but 63% at Washington State University.

Total summer session credit headcount enrollments have paralleled and reflected institutional enrollments during other terms. Historically, summer session headcount credit enrollments at Washington State University have fluctuated between 20-25% of the ensuing fall headcount credit enrollments. For example, the 1985 summer headcount credit enrollment was 24% of the fall 1985 enrollments, and in 1986, the percentage was 23%. Since 1981, with one exception in 1984, summer session enrollments declined reflecting and paralleling enrollments in other terms. Graduate credit hours were 23% of the summer student credit hours in 1986.[19]

For the 1984-1986 summer terms, combined credit enrollments in Education were 28.5% of all enrollments. For those years, 57.8% were undergraduates, 32.6% were graduate and professional, and 9.6% were special students. Of the undergraduates, 14.9% were freshman and sophomore enrollments, 74.9% were upper division and 10.1% were special students. No discernable trends were noted in composition of student summer enrollments.

University of Minnesota

As the 1980s decade began, outreach to the community emerged as an important topic of discussion at the University of Minnesota.[20] The Summer Session together with Continuing and Extension, Agricultural Extension and other units were viewed as playing an important role in offering educational opportunities to the state's residents. Periodically, staff have gathered data about the nature of the summer student population, summer students' assessment of their experience, and student suggestions for possible program modifications. These studies have determined reasons why students attend summer session and why some who expressed initial interest did not enroll. For example, in comparison with 1956, when 33% of the summer students were teachers or educational administrators, for the summer sessions 1981-1986, inclusive, only 19.5% of the summer session students on the twin cities campus were in Education. Such information is indicative of changing and evolving student needs and program emphasis.

For the years 1982-1986, inclusive, 70.7% of the students enrolled in summer session at the twin cities campus were also regularly enrolled students during other terms of the year. Of those who attended summer session only on the twin cities campus, 60.6% were first and second-year students both freshmen and other professional school students; 25% were third and fourth-year students; and 12.9% were graduate and adult special students. Missing or incorrect college codes represented 1.4%.[21] Of the academic year students who attended summer session during the five-year period, 19.4% were first or second-year students, and 62.2% were third and fourth-year students; 18.2% were graduate and adult special students, and only 0.2% were accounted for by incorrect codes. When both summer session only and regular academic year students were combined, the five-year summer enrollments consisted of 31.5% first and second-year students, 51.3% third and fourth-year students, and 16.7% graduate and adult special students. While there had been a small percentage decline in total summer enrollments from 1982 to 1986, most of the decline had been among regular academic year students. On a university campus like Minnesota, a small percentage decline of 7% represents approximately 1,300 students, more than some institutions enroll during summer session. The percentage of unduplicated men summer students each year was slightly less than for women, and for the five-year period, the percentage of men summer session students was 48.9%.

Total summer unduplicated enrollments at the University of Minnesota twin cities campus for the six-year period ending in 1986 were:

1981	18,564	1984	16,978
1982	18,474	1985	16,608
1983	18,290	1986	17,281

University of Virginia

At the University of Virginia, the mission of the summer session is to integrate the summer programs with those of the regular academic year.[22] In 1985 and 1986, percentages of undergraduates in the summer session enrollment were 55.8% and 58.9%, respectively; others were predominately graduate with about 0.2% professional. During each of the summers, undergraduate women slightly outnumbered men; for the two years the percentage of men was 49.3%. The same relationship was found for distribution of graduate enrollments, and men represented 47.3% of the summer enrollment for both summers combined. Of the total summer enrollments, two-thirds were Virginia residents.

University of Wisconsin

The University of Wisconsin-Madison Summer Session School, one of the oldest and largest in the country, is considered an integral part of the total program of the university. Through the Summer Sessions the university endeavors to provide an educational program of the same quality and as proportionately varied and well balanced as it provides during other parts of the academic year. Where once the summer session may have been viewed as an academic appendage, it was in the 1980s an intimate, essential, and substantial aspect of year-round operations epitomizing The Wisconsin Idea. The broad role of the summer session evolved from the universities' inheritance from three separate but complementary roots. They were the Crown academy with its emphasis on liberal instruction, the German university with its emphasis on research and advanced study, and the land-grant college with its emphasis on vocational training and community service. All schools and colleges are represented in the summer program, and the three functions of teaching, research, and public service are carried on without interruption. More individuals come to the Madison campus in summer term than any other three-month period of the year.[23]

Slightly over 80% of the summer students enrolled for credit are regularly enrolled undergraduates and graduates pursuing their education on a year-round basis. Shown in Table 10 are headcount summer credit enrollments for the recent eleven year period by percentages of men.[24]

Viewing Table 10, one can ascertain that there has been a trend for women to constitute steadily increasing proportions of the summer student credit enrollments. Also noteworthy of a trend is a steady decline in total numbers of summer credit students since enrollment peaked in the summer of 1983. Of all summer credit enrollments over the eleven-year period, 10% were in Education, and each year this percentage has remained about the same.

TABLE 10

ELEVEN YEARS OF SUMMER SESSION CREDIT ENROLLMENT AT UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN--MADISON

Year	Headcount Enrollment	Percent Men	Year	Headcount Enrollment	Percent Men
1986	15,449	51.4	1980	14,481	52.3
1985	15,468	52.3	1979	14,072	52.3
1984	15,529	52.9	1978	14,014	53.6
1983	15,767	53.7	1977	14,643	53.9
1982	15,409	53.2	1976	14,315	54.2
1981	15,302	53.0			

From 1982 to 1986, the percentage of non-resident enrollments increased steadily from 29.6% to 32.6%. Over the eleven-year period beginning in 1976, the percentages which freshman and sophomore summer credit enrollments were of all summer session undergraduates and to total summer session credit enrollments remained rather stable. They constituted 8.6% of the total enrollment and 17.5% of the undergraduate enrollment for the period. Most undergraduate summer enrollments were upper division students (82.5%). Percentages of special credit students have remained rather stable also, and they constituted 16% for the period. However, between 1979 and 1986 there was a steady increase from 44.9% to 51.9% in the percentage of undergraduate summer credit enrollments and a steady decrease from 37.3% to 32.9% in graduate and professional school summer credit enrollments. The significant increase in percentage which undergraduate enrollments were of total summer credit enrollments was due to increases at the junior and senior levels.

North Carolina State University

At North Carolina State University during Summer Session I, there was a gradual increase in summer enrollments from 7,074 in 1982 to 7,562 in 1986, an increase of nearly 7%. While graduate and professional enrollments decreased slightly from 11% to 9.8%, the undergraduate enrollment increased from 68.7% to 72.4%. While freshman and sophomore enrollments remained fairly stable, the increase was primarily at the upper division undergraduate level. While there has been a slight decline in the percentage of men enrolled during the Summer Session I period, men constituted about 60% of the 1986 enrollments. Over the five-year period, 88.2% of the enrollments were North Carolina residents. Of all Summer Session I enrollments, 71.4% were undergraduate,18.2% special students, 10.3% graduate and professional, and 0.1% agricultural institute. Lower division undergraduate students constituted 30% of the undergraduate enrollment and 21.4% of all summer students. Education students represented 5.2% of undergraduate and graduate enrollments and 4.4% of all summer enrollments. A marked characteristic of the summer session enrollments at this institution was the stability of the enrollment category percentages. Percentages of enrollments for the Summer Session II periods were similar in characteristics.[25]

The Pennsylvania State University

During the 1985 and 1986 summer sessions combined at the University Park campus there was a total of 21,010 credit students enrolled. Of those students 69% were undergraduate degree and non-degree students, 30.2% were graduate and professional students, and 0.8% were provisional.[26] Student characteristics for the 1986 University Park enrollments revealed slightly over one-half (55.3%) were men. Of the total 1986 summer enrollment, 63.7% were part-time students. Of the four-year degree, graduate, medical, provisional and non-degree undergraduate enrollment, 17.9% were freshmen and sophomores (in semesters 1-4) and students in the first eight semesters constituted 51.7% of all summer enrollments at the University Park campus; another 8.2% were in the 9th and 10th semesters. Graduate students represented 30.4% of the enrollments, and 9.7% were provisional and non-degree undergraduates.

University of Alberta

Data were collected at the University of Alberta from 418 students in 18 randomly selected 1988 summer courses offered by the Faculties of Arts and Education.[27] Two-thirds of all Summer Session courses were offered by these Faculties. Fourteen percent of the students were in senior and graduate level courses, while 86 percent were in the first three undergraduate year courses.

The study sought to determine what students' experiences had been in Summer Session and how they came to register in summer courses.

Two-thirds of the students were age 23 or over, 69 percent were female, and 65 percent lived in Edmonton. Slightly over one-half (51%) were full-time students, and only 22% were teachers. Nearly two-thirds (64%) were either on leave from their jobs or not working. More than two-thirds (69%) had been registered full or part-time during the previous Second Term of the next previous Winter Session. Most summer students enrolled in one or more three-week three-credit courses, for only 4.1 percent had registered in one six-credit course. The largest group (40%) were not majoring in either Arts or Education. Nearly one-fifth (19%) of the summer students worked twenty or more hours per week. Only about four percent were visiting students from other institutions.

Thus, the typical summer student was a mature undergraduate female who resided locally and was not employed. Most had been full-time Winter Session students majoring in some field other than Arts or Education and registered for two three-credit courses in Summer Session.

Most prevalent reasons for enrolling in Summer Session by order of mention were (1) to speed up degree completion (72%), (2) to ease course load during other sessions (52%), (3) to focus attention on one course (46%), and (4) to enjoy a learning experience (38%). Only seven percent indicated they enrolled to pick up a failed course, and 15 percent sought to make up either University or other degree program deficiencies. Seven or more students out of every ten indicated satisfaction with registration, the availability and completeness of information and library resources, morning classes, three-week three-credit course schedules, and size of classes. Statistically significant more students age 30 or more (.05) and graduate students (.01) enrolled in summer to speed up degree completion. Significantly more undergraduates (.01) and those age 18-22 (.01) than others registered to pick up a dropped course. Significantly more students age 18-22 than others (.01) also enrolled during summer to focus attention on one course, to ease other term course loads, or to make up Faculty/program transfer deficiencies.

Summary

Where once the primary motivation for attending summer session was to renew or upgrade licenses for teaching or administration in common schools, by 1960 it had become clear that the summer period was also attracting persons from a wide range of other occupational groups who wished to enhance their job qualifications. Other categories included the accelerant, the deficient, the visitor from another institution, the regular student from other terms, the non-classified special student, the undergraduate, and the graduate. Degree credit students sought degrees at all levels and in offerings rivaling those in breadth of other term offerings.

There is considerable variation between public and private institutions and among institutions in either category of control regarding the percentage which summer term enrollment is of the previous fall term enrollment. The range seems to be from about 30 percent to 45 percent. Whereas, the proportion of men outnumber women attending summer session in some institutions, in others the converse is true. Nationally, the proportion of men is slightly higher than for women. During the last two decades trends experienced generally in summer enrollments were the increase in proportion of other term degree seeking students and the decline in the proportion of visiting students. Many institutions witnessed a change in classification level mix of students with an increase in undergraduate enrollments, particularly at the upper division level. There has been also a general increase in the percent age of older mature students enrolling in summer.

Although in the earlier decades of this century summer was a period where deficient students sought to pass courses they had failed or to make up program deficiencies, the prime motivation for summer work in the 1980s is to accelerate degree programs, to take courses the regular term schedule wouldn't permit or to lighten other term course loads, and to take courses for enrichment and enjoyment. Although the summer term may continue to serve some students who are deficient, they constitute a small minority of summer enrollments.

Variances among institutions in student characteristics were reflected in the presentations concerning students in several institutions. Perhaps this chapter will encourage personnel in some other institutions to examine and to monitor trends in summer student characteristics along the several avenues suggested.

Chapter 6 -- Endnotes

1. Clarence A. Schoenfeld and Donald N. Zillman, The American University in Summer (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), 44.

2. Alexander H. Rice, "Why the Summer School?" Journal of Education 115 (May 1932):353; 369.

3. Arwood S. Northby, "The Place of the Summer Session in the Collegiate Training of Undergraduate Students in Education," School and Society 43 (June 1936):823-24.

4. U.S. Office of Education, Biennial Survey of Education, Statistics of Higher Education 1955-56, Chapter IV, Section 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1955), 44; 118-22; 136-140.

5. John E. Stecklein, Mary Corcoran and E. W. Ziebarth, "The University Summer Session: An Appendage or Part of the Whole?" College and University 35 (Spring 1960):310-11.

6. U.S. Office of Education, Summer Sessions in Colleges and Universities of the United States 1960 by Donald F. Warner, et al., Circular No. 700 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963), 65-70.

7. John E. Stecklein, et al., op. cit.

8. Jeanne Solberg and Darwin D. Hendel. An Education of the 1980 Summer Session. St. Paul: Measurement Services Center, University of Minnesota, 1981, pp. 26-32.

9. Ibid., pp. 85-6.

10. Alton L. Taylor and Frank Papovich. Biennial Evaluation and Planning Report. Charlottesville: Office of the Summer Session, University of Virginia, 1986, pp. 39-40.

11. Harland E. Samson, et al., Assessment of Summer Sessions Curricular Needs (Madison: Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, 1982), 43-6.

12. Michael J. Keller, "Factors Influencing Students' Decision to Attend Summer School," College Student Journal 16(4) (Winter 1982): 348-352.

13. David C. Montgomery, "The Encouragement of Summer Enrollment." College and University 57 (Summer 1982):353-364.

14. Ibid., Georgia Board of Regents, University System of Georgia Annual Report for Fiscal Year July 1, 1976-June 30, 1977 (Atlanta: The Regents, 1977), ERIC, ED 156 040, 18-19.

15. Pennsylvania Department of Education, Higher Education Summer and Fall Enrollments, 1983 (Harrisburg: The Department, 1983), ERIC, ED 262 709, 2; 6.

16. Nancy Abraham, 1977 Summer Sessions Associations' Second Joint Statistical Report (Alfred, New York: Alfred University Office of Summer Sessions, 1977), 10-13.

17. *Summer Sessions Associations' Joint Statistical Reports, 1979-1984*, (Alfred, New York: Alfred University Office of Summer Sessions, 1984).

18. U.S. Office of Education, *Biennial Survey of Education, Statistics of Higher Education: 1955-56*, Chapter IV (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956), 44.

19. Office of Summer Session, *1987 Summer Session Planning Guide* (Pullman: Summer Session Office, Washington State University, 1987), 20-21 and *1986 Summer Session Planning Guide*, 19-20.

20. Jeanne Solberg and Darwin D. Hendel, *An Evaluation of the 1980 Summer Session* (St. Paul: Measurement Services Center, University of Minnesota, 1981), 1-4.

21. Office of Summer Session, *Continuity of Registration Reports 1982-1986*, (St. Paul: University of Minnesota, 1986).

22. Alton L. Taylor and Frank Papovich, *Biennial Evaluation and Planning Report*, 29-33.

23. Harland E. Samson, et al., *Assessment of Summer Sessions Curricular Needs*, 1-3.

24. Office of the Registrar, *University of Wisconsin-Madison Enrollment Reports for Summer Sessions, 1982-1986* (Madison: Office of the Registrar, University of Wisconsin, 1986); *Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, Summer Session Annual Reports 1982-1986* (Madison: The Division, 1986).

25. Office of Institutional Research, *Summer Session I and II Budget Enrollment Reports 1982-1986*, (Raleigh: The Office, North Carolina State University, 1986).

26. Office of Summer Session, *Enrollment Reports, 1985 and 1986*, (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1986).

27. Paula Brook, Don Chapman, and Peter Wright, *Summer Session Learning Experiences at the University of Alberta*; a Report for the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: Adult, Career and Technology Education Faculty, University of Alberta, 1989).

CHAPTER 7

INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF FOR SUMMER TERMS

Introduction

Historically a major concern of collegiate administrators and researchers has been the quality comparability of summer term instruction with that of the regular academic year term, especially in institutions where the summer session was not considered to be a fourth quarter or third semester. By 1920, the summer session idea had expanded among four-year institutions of higher education. This expansion was propelled by a combination of factors not the least among them was the encouragement given during WWI for meeting national defense emergency needs and the converging pressures for teacher credentialing. From several quarters criticisms were leveled at the quality of summer term academic work as being inferior. Foundations for this criticism sprung from evidence that, compared to regular year term faculty, teachers were often expected to carry heavier loads and that the percentages of higher degrees held were lower. To provide perspective on this matter, a brief sketch is given on the development of summer term faculty qualifications.

Faculty Qualifications to 1960

The U.S. Office of Education obtained a 95.5% response in 1960 from 1,081 four-year collegiate institutions about faculty teaching in the main term summer session.[1] Faculties consisted of 24.1% full professors, 20.9% associate professors, 23.9% assistant professors, 16.8% instructors, and 14.3% others. The other category included such groups as administrators without faculty designation, assistant instructors, and graduate assistants. Of all summer teaching faculty in four-year colleges and universities, 46.7% were in universities; 32.9% were in liberal arts colleges; 15.7% were in teachers colleges; 2.4% were in technological schools; and, 2.3% were in art schools, theological/religious schools, and other miscellaneous types.

Men represented 77.8% of the 1960 main term summer faculty in all types of institutions. Women constitute 14.9% of the full and associate professors, 27% of the assistant professors and instructors, and 29.5% of the others. As a percentage of summer faculty, women represented 15.1% in universities, 32.1% in liberal arts colleges, 27.1% in teachers colleges, 3.7% in technological colleges, and 10.8% in all other types of four-year institutions.

TABLE 11
PERCENTAGES OF CLASSIFIED FACULTY FOR REGULAR AND SUMMER TERM, 1960

Institution Type	Summer 1960	Regular Term 1959-60
1. Professor and Associate Professor		
Universities	55.5	54.0
Liberal Arts Colleges	49.0	47.0
Teachers Colleges	53.0	45.1
2. Assistant Professor		
Universities	25.5	28.9
Liberal Arts Colleges	29.3	32.4
Teachers Colleges	32.3	35.9
3. Instructors		
Universities	19.0	17.1
Liberal Arts Colleges	21.6	20.6
Teachers Colleges	14.7	19.0

SOURCE: W. Robert Bokelman and L. D'Amico, "A Comparison of 1959-60 Average Salaries of Selected Faculty Groups," College and University 36 (Spring 1961):315 and U.S. Office of Education, Summer Sessions in Colleges and Universities of the United States 1960, Circular No. 700, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963, pp. 54-55.

The combined percentage of summer full and associate professors in all four-year collegiate institutions was 44.9%. Percentages by type of institution were universities 46.3%, liberal arts colleges 42.9%, 48.3% in teachers colleges, 36.1% in technological colleges, and 33.0% in all other types of four-year colleges. The combined percentage of summer term assistant professors and instructors was 40.7% for all four-year institutions. These ranks constituted 37.1% in universities, 44.8% in liberal arts colleges, 42.8% in teachers colleges, 48.9% in technological colleges, and 34.1% in other types of four-year colleges. Other types of unclassified persons provided instruction in 14.4% of all institutions. The highest percentage was 16.7% in universities. Liberal arts colleges had 12.3% other staff, teachers colleges 8.9%, technological colleges 15.0%, and all other colleges including art, theological and others 32.9%.

The ranks held by summer session faculty in universities, liberal arts colleges, and teachers colleges with percentages of the 1959-60 regular term faculties were as shown in Table 11.

Observation reveals that of the classified faculty, the percentage of full and associate professors in all three types of institutions was greater during the summer than during the regular academic term, and except for teachers colleges, so were the percentages of instructors. There were larger percentages of assistant professors during the regular term than during the summer term, but percentages of difference were small. If academic rank is an index which reflects both education and experience, and if the assumption is valid that quality instruction is associated with rank, then one might conclude that the quality of summer instruction was comparable with regular term instruction.

The percentages of different degrees held by faculty members in all terms of the 1960 summer session by type of institution are shown below.[2]

Type of Institution	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorates	Other
Universities	9.0	36.2	53.7	1.1
Liberal Arts Colleges	7.9	53.2	37.8	1.1
Teachers Colleges	3.4	56.1	39.3	1.2
Totals (U, LA, TC)	7.7	45.5	45.8	1.1
Technological Schools	25.1	42.3	29.1	3.4
Theological/Religious Schools	13.7	29.3	51.5	5.4
Other Schools (4-Yr)	34.0	34.3	19.7	11.9

Percentages of summer faculty master's and doctor's degrees were approximately reversed between universities and liberal arts colleges; teachers colleges had slightly higher but approximately the same percentage of doctorates as did liberal arts colleges. Theological or religious schools with 51.5% doctorates approximated the university percentage of 53.7%, but technological and other four-year schools had the lowest percentages. There was a difference between public and private institutions. The percentage of summer faculty with doctorates in universities was 54.8% public and 51.3% private, in liberal arts colleges 44.4% public and 34.0% private, and in teachers colleges 40.0% public and 29.1% private. Thus the percentage of summer faculty with doctorates in public institutions of these types was greater than in private institutions.

The 1960 status of summer faculty credentials was a considerable improvement from 1916 when southern colleges and universities were found to have 22.6% doctorates and 29.0% master's, and southern teachers colleges and normal school summer faculties had 1.6% and 17.0%, respectively.[3] Simultaneously, non-southern colleges and universities had 31.0% doctorates and 25.0% master's, and teachers colleges and normal schools had 6.6% and 22.7%, respectively.

A wide range of teaching loads was reported for the 1960 summer term, but the most common was a 6-hour teaching load in institutions on the semester calendar. There was no comparable figure for institutions on a quarter system, but for institutions not considering the summer as a fourth quarter the most frequently found load was 10 hours. Although data were incomplete, a suspicion was reported that many teachers were more heavily burdened in summer than during the academic year due to the supervision of theses and dissertations resulting from increased amounts of graduate work offered during summer sessions.

Recent Summer Faculty Profiles

Information about the characteristics of summer term faculty are difficult to obtain. Many institutions report information about the nature of summer enrollments, offerings, and costs but do not report similar information about faculty. There is presently no single national depository of information about summer term faculty, students, offerings, or other matters. These data are not requested by the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) conducted on a regular basis by the U.S. Office of Education. The writers sought to obtain information about summer faculty from several selected institutions, but most reported such information, while buried in record systems, was not readily accessible. Information made available by two major research universities is presented here as being illustrative.

Institution A

In 1986, there were 15,338 students enrolled in the summer term of which one-third were undergraduates. Of the total 1,300 faculty, only 4.2% were visiting faculty from other universities. By rank, the 1986 summer term faculty consisted of: professors 47.8%, associate professors 23.2%, assistant professors 21.0%, and academic professional and other academic 8.0%. Of all faculty, 84.4% devoted their summer service time to individualized instruction, and 15.6% provided classroom instruction. By rank, the percentages of regular faculty providing classroom instruction were professors--10.8%, associate and assistant professors--12.4% each, academic professionals 26.9%, and other academics 78.0%. The percentages providing individualized instruction were professors 89.2%, associate and assistant professors 87.6%, academic professionals 73.1%, and other academics 22.0%.

Of the regular (permanent) faculty 56.3% held summer term appointments following an academic year appointment, 23% were on 12-month contracts, and 20.7% were academic year only appointments that provided summer term service at essentially no additional cost.

The percentage distributions of all faculty by field and by nature of summer term service are shown in Table 12. Over one-half (54%) of the faculty were in liberal arts and sciences and engineering fields. Next in order of size were the fields of agriculture (13.8%), fine and applied arts (7.3%), education (7.1%), and business (5%). One can discern that large percentages of faculty are engaged during summer session in individualized instruction, primarily the direction of theses and dissertations. For example, more than three-fourths (77.4%) of the College of Education faculty are on the payroll to provide individualized instruction, while less than one-fourth (22.6%) provide classroom instruction.

Institution B

Of the 20,295 1986 summer student seat count in this institution, approximately one-half were undergraduates. Approximately 79.8 were in-state residents, 9.5% foreign students, and 10.7% from each of the other 49 states and the District of Columbia. In this institution, summer enrollments had approximated 38% of the preceding fall enrollments over a five-year period and produced about 27% as many credits.

TABLE 12

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SUMMER FACULTY BY SCHOOL/COLLEGE AND TYPE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE

Faculty By School/College	All Faculty	Type of Instructional Service Classroom	Individualized
Graduate	0.6	0.0	100.0
Environmental Studies	0.2	0.0	100.0
Applied Life Studies	2.3	3.0	97.0
Agriculture	13.8	5.0	95.0
Engineering	22.8	6.1	93.9
Vet Medicine	3.5	6.7	93.3
Communications	0.9	8.3	91.7
Liberal Arts and Sciences	31.2	13.5	86.5
Labor and Industrial Relations	0.7	22.2	77.8
Education	7.1	22.6	77.4
Business	5.0	30.8	69.2
International Studies	1.1	35.7	64.3
Fine and Applied Arts	7.3	35.8	64.2
Social Work	1.2	37.5	62.5
Law	0.8	90.0	10.0
Medical Science	0.3	100.0	0.0
Aviation	1.2	100.0	0.0

Of the 3,475 FTE summer term faculty, only 1% were visiting faculty. The total summer faculty consisted of 29.4% full professors, 25.5% associate professors, and 45.1% assistant professors or instructors. Approximately 55% held nine-month appointments, and the rest were on twelve-month appointments.

National Faculty Profiles

There is no recent nation-wide information available on the composition of summer faculty by rank and gender for different types of institutions. It is known from the 1960 study and from recent contact with summer session administrators that a variance exists from one institution to the next in the extent to which summer session faculty characteristics are similar to or different from those of faculty in other terms. To provide a basis for comparison with characteristics of faculty in four-year institutions nationally data are presented in Table 13 for the 1984 year.[4] One can see that of the professors in universities, 93% were men and 7% were women and that these percentages varied by type of institution. Of all professors, regardless of institution type, about one-eighth (12%) were women. As rank decreased, the proportion of women increased. In four-year institutions of all types, regardless of rank, slightly over one-fifth (22%) were women.

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGES OF FACULTY BY RANK, GENDER, AND TYPE OF FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTION

Rank and Gender	Universities	Liberal Arts Col.	Teachers Colleges	Other, Including Tech. Col.	Art and Theological	Total USA
Professor	26	22	23	16	22	24
Male	93	81	86	96	93	88
Female	7	19	14	4	7	12
Associate Professor	20	21	25	20	11	21
Male	88	75	76	97	91	81
Female	12	25	24	3	9	19
Assistant Professor	21	26	29	27	10	24
Male	83	70	70	97	88	77
Female	17	30	30	3	12	23
Instructor	16	19	13	22	24	17
Male	76	54	58	94	88	67
Female	24	46	42	6	12	33
Other	17	12	9	15	33	14
Male	80	48	65	98	87	70
Female	20	52	35	2	13	30
USA						
Male	85	68	73	96	89	78
Female	15	32	27	4	11	22

The largest percentage of women (32%), regardless of rank, was in liberal arts colleges, and the smallest percentage (4%) was in technological colleges. The largest percentages of women were at the instructor or non-rank level in universities and in liberal arts and teachers colleges. Shown also are the percentages of faculty, by rank, within each type of institution. A higher percentage (26%) of professors were found in universities than in other types of institutions. Nationally nearly one-half the faculty were evenly divided between rank of assistant and full professor (24% each). Individual colleges and universities might find this kind of information about faculty teaching during summer term on their campus compared to faculty teaching in other terms useful in monitoring the quality of summer faculty. In some cases this type of information might help dispell the notion that summer session instruction is somehow less respectable than instruction during other periods of the year.

The percentages of summer faculty at each rank in institution A and B discussed above can be compared to the percentages for faculty teaching in other terms as shown in Table 13. One can determine that the summer distribution of faculty by rank for Institution B was similar, while percentages of professors in Institution A summer term were considerably larger than in universities generally.

Summer Faculty Selection

Historically, whether a faculty member taught in a collegiate summer session has depended upon an individual's desire to do so. Individuals either choose or are chosen in a variety of ways and with a number of considerations in mind. While there may be various considerations such as desire to travel, to engage in research activity, to do professional writing, or to engage in more remunerative short term employment elsewhere, not the least of major considerations for individual choice is the need to supplement the regular academic year salary. From the institution's standpoint, such factors as teaching competence, individual interest, student needs, previous courses taught, program requirements, availability of instructors, previous evaluations of the instructor, course times and location, and seniority have been used singularly or in combination as selection criteria.

When financial resources are scarce and competition exists among faculty for summer session teaching positions a system of rotation may be used to determine who of the qualified full-time competent faculty available for specific courses may be selected. Seniority and rank have been used as bases for selection. Desire of a faculty member to teach has usually been given priority over substitute, adjunct, or part-time faculty requesting summer teaching assignments.

Some form of established point system has been used for summer faculty selection. Under such a system each faculty member would earn a given number of points (e.g., 9) for each year of employment at that institution from the beginning date of (full-time) employment. For each credit hour of summer session teaching, a point would be deducted, and faculty having the highest number of points would be selected. They would have received the fewest summer assignments in terms of their years of full-time teaching service at that institution. If more than one individual had the same number of points, then seniority might prevail. Implementation of such a system would require the keeping of adequate records for faculty to be treated equitably in doling out assignments.

Faculty Motivations and Perceptions Regarding Summer Session Teaching

Little is known about the characteristics of faculty who teach in collegiate summer sessions, their needs, or their perceptions of summer students compared to the traditional nine-month academic year students. While the notion has traditionally existed that summer has been a period of relaxation and/or catching up, the size of summer enrollments at many institutions belie this view. Sketchy information available on summer student characteristics, scope of curricular offerings, and organization of instructional schedules indicate that the summer collegiate environment is different from that of the regular academic year in most institutions. The needs, characteristics, and perceptions of college and university faculty teaching in regular nine-month academic year terms have been well studied.[5] However, the paucity of literature regarding collegiate summer schools reflects in attention to summer time faculty.

Responses from a random sample of summer faculty in a large state research university revealed that there were no statistically significant differences in the gender, ethnic, or rank composition of summer and academic year faculty in a number of ways.[6] Approximately six of every ten worked during the first summer session period only, and about one of every ten worked both summer session periods. Summer faculty activity consisted of teaching (42%), research (25%), writing (17%), and other activities (16%). Factors of most importance in faculty decisions to work during the summer or not were the need for money overall and adequacy of salary for the time. Next in importance was the adequacy of free time and length of session coupled with time required each day. Relatively unimportant to whether faculty would work during summer session were opportunities of teaching new or different courses, opportunity to take a vacation, whether the faculty member was awarded a grant, or whether faculty were required by their department to teach. Although faculty members were generally not in favor of having visiting faculty during the summer, they would consider teaching at another campus. Faculty did not view summer classes as being very different from those during the regular year. In general faculty did not want to teach more courses in summer, but they would consider teaching a new course if they were paid more for it.

Faculty were asked what they liked best and least about summer session. The most common positive responses were that summer work provided supplemental income, classes were generally smaller and allowed for better student--faculty interaction, and the split term permitted them to take off one-half the summer. Liked least by faculty were insufficient time to cover all the material and have it sink into students, taxing daily class sessions, contingent contracts, and inadequate level of remuneration. Opinions of faculty were not found to differ by characteristics of gender, academic rank, or summer teaching experience.

Some significant differences in opinions among faculty were found related to level of academic year salary. Faculty members with the highest salaries more than those lowest paid were less in favor of attending any summer workshops focused on teaching problems or based on topics of general faculty interest. Highest paid faculty also were less inclined to teach more courses for the summer than were those whose salaries were at either the lowest or moderate levels. Lower paid faculty were more in favor of visiting professors being hired than were other faculty and attached less importance to adequacy of summer pay or general financial need in deciding whether to work in summer. Moderately more than higher paid faculty felt that obtaining a grant was even less important in deciding whether to work during summer session. Opinions did not differ according to duration of time faculty had been at the university except in two respects. Those with the longest duration viewed summer session goals as being the same as for the regular year and were less favorable to hiring visiting summer faculty.

Faculty Remuneration

A survey was conducted of 1,866 randomly selected faculty members who offered courses in the fall of both 1983 and 1984 in all types of colleges and universities except law and medical colleges, proprietary schools, private two-year colleges, and colleges with fewer than 500 students.[7] This nation-wide study produced information on financial remuneration of faculty for summer session work. Results indicated that faculty members in public institutions were more likely to teach summer school than were their counterparts in non-public colleges and universities. Whereas, large institutions can afford to offer a wide variety of courses covering basic to advanced topics and use income from large classes to defray costs of small classes, this may not be possible for small institutions that find income inadequate to offer specialized courses and are thus less attractive for students looking for breadth and depth in offerings.

Methods of Determining Faculty Salaries

The most commonly found practice for determining faculty summer session salaries was to compute them as a percentage of academic-year pay. Earnings were highest for faculty in engineering and business and economics disciplines and lowest for those in fine and applied arts, physical education, and vocational education. Average percentages of base salary, excluding fringe benefits, in public doctoral institutions ranged from 9% (vocational education including health, home economics and nursing) to 20% (engineering); the median was 13.5%. Among non-public doctoral institutions the range was 6% (physical education) to 16% (social sciences including education); the median was 9.5%. In public comprehensive institutions (defined as those with more than 1,500 students, a liberal arts program, and at least one professional program), the percentage range was 9% to 19%; the median was 13.75%, while for non-public comprehensive institutions the range was 7% to 22%; the median was 13.5%. The range in private liberal arts colleges was 6% to 14% with a median of 10%.

Rates of Remuneration

Rate of faculty summer pay also varied according to rank. Percentages of base pay for professors in all types of institutions ranged from 9% in vocational education to 18% in engineering, and for associate and assistant professors the ranges were 10% in vocational education to 17% in engineering and 9% in fine and applied arts to 16% in engineering, respectively.

Upon contact with 100 randomly selected collegiate institutions enrolling over 15,000 students during the academic year, Hutchinson and Johnson found that summer faculty were paid two/ninths (22.2%) of their previous academic year's salary for a 2-month 6 credit hour summer work load in only 19.5% of the institutions.[8] Most summer salary determinations reflected percentages ranging from 11% to 34% of the academic year's salary with an average of 17.4%. In one institution the pay scale rationale for summer was that during the academic year faculty actually devoted 70% of their time to teaching and 30% to research and service. Full-time summer salary rate was calculated as 70% of the academic year salary multiplied by 22.2%. Such a model reflects the expectation that faculty will engage in only teaching apparently to the exclusion of other activities. While about one-third (32%) of the institutions guaranteed faculty salaries, regardless of enrollment, slightly over one-half (52%) used enrollment contingency contracts; 16% reported other arrangements. In 1985, about three-fourths (74%) of the research, doctoral granting and comprehensive institutions in the United States were found to use contingency contracts for summer session teaching faculty.[9] This practice was also found in 73 percent of all public two-year colleges enrolling 1,500 or more students.[10]

Salary Structures

As has been indicated there exists a substantial variation among collegiate institutions, even those of rather homogeneous enrollment size, in summer session salary structures. Under conditions of rising inflation and increasingly scarce financial resources, regular operating budget summer session funds have become the target for reduction, thus forcing summer session activities to be partially or even totally self-supporting. Rates of compensation for faculty services have come under review as competition among faculty has increased for summer appointments. Often the self-support budgetary configurations which imply only teaching services have failed to accommodate adequately the needs of master's and doctor's level students needing advisement and supervision which research, thesis preparation, and examination require. Either students required to pay increasingly higher tuition rates get short-changed or faculty serve them without just compensation. Faculty salaries based upon headcount or full-time equivalent enrollment driven contingencies for classes fail to accommodate adequately the needs of graduate students returning during summer session with the expectation of pursuing credit work other than graded course completion. If a collegiate institution has as part of its objectives the provision of graduate programs in summer, then moral and ethical considerations would seem to require the availability of appropriate faculty services, particularly of senior professors, whether class enrollments materialize or not. Perhaps some way can be found to use graduate credit enrollments either alone or in conjunction with headcount class enrollments as a basis for salary and load determination for summer session. In all fairness to faculty and students alike, the financial policies of an institution should be aligned with and facilitate the objectives which the institution purports to attain.

In addition to student enrollment driven formulas for compensating summer faculty there are several other methods. One method is to pay an amount per contact hour. Another method is to pay faculty on the basis of dollars per course the amount to be varied to accommodate the number of credit hours generated by the course. Pay may also be based on the number of contact hours per week. Not an uncommonly found method is the establishment of a flat fee regardless of rank applicable to all faculty alike, sometimes based on a median level of academic year salaries. Such a method holds little incentive for faculty whose regular academic year salaries are in the upper ranges. A flat fee differentiated by professional rank is another variation. Remuneration has also been determined upon the amount of student fees collected. Another practice has been to calculate a portion of the compensation on the basis of student fees collected and the rest of some other basis. The latter two practices were inherited from the early informal organization of summer sessions and are seldom if ever found today.

The basing of faculty compensation in whole or in part upon student fees collected, as was the practice before summer session was recognized in some quarters as an integral and creditable part of the total year's collegiate work, led to problems. Chief among the problems was the temptation of officials and professors to lower entrance standards and to soften the work in order to attract more students. Over half a century ago Floyd Reeves, John Dale Russell and others advocated the practice of setting summer session salaries on the basis of a fixed percentage of salary received during the traditional academic year. They said:

> To pay all teachers a flat sum, regardless of rank or annual salary, is apt to result in a relatively inferior summer-session faculty, since the lower salaried members will be glad to stay while the more capable will tend to accept summer-session positions at other institutions having a more satisfactory salary policy. To a less extent, the fixing of salaries at a flat rate on the basis of rank held is unsatisfactory, and operates much in the same manner as the policy of a flat rate for all regardless of rank or salary. These policies are not usually followed during the regular year, and it is difficult to see how the flat-rate plan can be more acceptable during the summer than during the other nine months.[11]

Collective Bargaining

Faculty collective bargaining agreements typically define summer session teaching as overload or extra-contractual services above and beyond the normal teaching load. Some agreements contain guarantees of summer school teaching assignments, even though classes may be cancelled. In that case faculty may do administrative research, curriculum development, or engage in some other productive activity.[12] Maximum summer teaching workloads are normally limited to 5-7 credit hours per eight-week session. In 1980, average summer load compensation per credit hour was $352 in 65 public four-year institutions and $312 in 76 four-year non-public institutions as stipulated in union contract agreements examined.

Summer Faculty Morale

During the early 1980s some summer session administrators expressed concern about the morale of summer faculty and what was happening to it. In a 1982 study sponsored by a joint Research Committee of the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators (WASSA) and the North American Association of Summer Sessions (NAASS) an inquiry was made as to how, in general, public collegiate summer session administrators believed summer faculty morale had changed since 1978.[13] Administrators were asked which of several trends were believed to have affected morale either directly or indirectly. Trends related to number of credit hours offered or generated, average number of students in courses and numbers of courses taken by students, numbers of courses offered and headcount student enrollments, sources and amount of financial support, ratio of summer enrollment to other term enrollments, proportion of visiting summer students, and degree of administrative centralization for summer programming.

One-third of the Canadian respondents each indicated morale had decreased, increased, or remained the same. However, in the United States, faculty morale was reported to have decreased most in doctoral granting institutions (46%) and to have increased most in research universities (50%). In all USA public collegiate institutions belonging to either association morale was reported to have decreased or remained the same in 27% each and to have increased in 46%. About one-third (34%) of the USA and 43% of the Canadian respondents indicated trends regarding some of the factors mentioned above had affected morale positively, while 49 and 71 percentages, respectively, indicated morale had been affected negatively by some trends.

Trends reported to have affected faculty morale positively were increases in dollar amounts of financial support, numbers of headcount students enrolled, numbers of courses offered for credit, total number of credit hours offered, number of credit hours generated, average number of courses taken by students, numbers of summer term undergraduate visitors, and percentage which the non-duplicative headcount enrollment for summer was of the enrollment for other terms. Whether the degree of administrative centralization increased, decreased, or remained the same, change seemed to have had a positive effect on morale. The fact that the total number of credit hours generated and numbers of students in courses remained the same were reported as affecting faculty morale positively. Certain other factors as increased salaries, funded research opportunities, and fewer cancelled classes were also positive morale factors.

Conditions identified by summer session administrators as affecting negatively the morale of faculty were in most cases factors that made faculty happy when they saw increases. They were decreases in financial support, student enrollments, hours generated, and courses offered, inadequate salary and stipend levels, conditional contracts and cancelled classes, and perceived widening gaps between increased financial support and credit hours generated and rates of pay for summer term service.

Summary

By 1960 it had become apparent that, in general, the degree qualifications of summer faculty were higher than of faculty teaching during other terms. There were variances among institutions by control and type. By the mid-1980s, the distribution of summer faculty by faculty or college reflected the heterogeniety of student interests spread over many fields of instruction with only about 7% of all summer faculty in Education. Most faculty teach in summer because they choose to do so with a primary purpose to supplement their salaries from other academic terms. Most faculty work during the first portion of the summer term. Faculty are more likely in public than in non-public institutions to teach during summer. The most common practice for determining faculty summer salaries is to compute them as a percentage of the pay for other academic terms. Contingency contracts were used by about three-fourths (74%) of the public two-year colleges enrolling over 1,500 students and of the public and private doctoral granting, research, and comprehensive universities. Collective bargaining units typically define summer teaching as overload or extra contractual services.

University faculty with the highest salary level and the longest work tenure favored less than others the utilization of summer visiting professors. Faculty morale seems to be positively related to increases in financial support, enrollments, courses and credit hours offered, and change in degree of administrative centralization. Likewise decreases in support, offerings, and enrollments affect morale adversely.

Chapter 7 -- Endnotes

1. U.S. Office of Education, Summer Sessions in Colleges and Universities of the United States 1960, Circular No. 700 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963), 52-64.

2. Ibid., 59-61.

3. Cornelius, D. Judd, The Summer School as an Agency for the Training of Teachers in the United States, Contributions to Education No. 3 (Ph.D. dissertation, Peabody College for Teachers, 1921), 68-73.

4. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Center for Education Statistics, Instructional Faculty Salaries for Academic Year 1984-85 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1986).

5. J. N. Gustad, The Career Decisions of College Teachers (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1960); Ruth E. Eckert and John E. Stecklein, Job Motivations and Satisfactions of College Teachers: A Study of Faculty Members in Minnesota Colleges (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1961); H. B. Livesey, The Professors: Who They Are, What They Do, What They Really Want, and What They Need (New York: Charterhouse, 1975); R. M. Beazley, Salaries and Tenure of Institutional Faculty in Institutions in the U.S. in 1974-75 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, Education Division, 1975).

6. Terrence J. Tracey, William E. Sedlacek, and Aldrich M. Patterson, Jr., "Perceptions of Summer School Faculty at a Large University," Counseling Center Research Report No. 7-80 (College Park, Maryland: Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, 1980), ERIC, ED 208 740.

7. Jean Evangelauf, "Half of All Faculty Members Taught in Summer and Earned an Average of $3,900, Survey Finds," The Chronicle of Higher Education 30(20) (17 July 1985):23; 25.

8. Jerry E. Hutchison and A. E. Johnson, Jr., "Summer Session Faculty Salaries," Research in Higher Education 20(3) (1984):375-77.

9. Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall, Recent Changes in Summer Sessions of U.S. and Canadian Colleges and Universities (St. Louis: North American Association of Summer Sessions, 1986), 33, ERIC, ED 279 264.

10. Raymond J. Young, Summer Sessions in Public Two-Year Colleges, Monograph Series of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1989), ERIC 304 202.

11. Floyd W. Reeves, et al., The Liberal Arts College (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932), 344.

12. Ernest R. Goeres, Compensation for Overload and Extra Contractual Services. Collective Bargaining Perspectives (Morgantown, West Virginia: West Virginia University, 1977), 2-5, ERIC, ED 140 711; Joel M. Douglas, Loren A. Krause, and Leonard Winogora, Workload and Productivity Bargaining in Higher Education, Monograph No. 3 (New York: Bernard Baruch College National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, 1980), 13, ERIC, ED 196 346.

13. Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall, Relationships of Selected Factors to Summer Session Organizational Structure (Calgary: University of Calgary Continuing Education Faculty, 1982), 48, ERIC, ED 235 734.

CHAPTER 8

THE COLLEGIATE ACADEMIC CALENDAR

Introduction

So much of educational planning has been generated with the cart before the horse, as it were. In all too many instances, such factors as the availability of funds, or the lack of them, have been permitted to dictate educational policy and practice. Building projects for educational facilities, for example, have been completed according to conceptions held by architects or engineers about what the space configurations and size should be of educational facilities with little regard to the nature of what educators would like to have happen in the spaces. In other instances, the physical size of facilities constructed have been reduced throughout the entire project to fit an available amount of funds rather than the construction of adequate space on a phased plan, so when completed, there would be an adequate facility throughout. In these instances, educational policy and practices have occurred within the restraints and constrictions imposed by the facility. Education facilities should constitute one of the means to an end, rather than the end in itself for the self-aggrandizement of architects, engineers, or community residents of power and influence. Such facilities should take their physical form from the planning by educators of requirements designed to implement practice based upon a philosophy of education and knowledge of how human beings learn.

In the same way, the academic calendar adopted by a college or university is a powerful educational instrument that in itself is not an end, but rather a means toward an end. In so many instances, the academic calendar has been determined by non-educational planners frivolously for reasons extraneous to educational considerations. Chief among the reasons has been the quest of systems oriented planners for standardization and uniformity to facilitate accounting and record keeping objectives. Another reason found less frequently is to conform to the calendars of other nearby institutions. Another reason to change calendars is for the purpose of causing a re-examination and reorganization by the faculty of what is to be taught and how it is to be taught best. This reason is based upon a view of human nature that individuals are innately lazy, adamantly resistant to change or improvement, and need to be prodded into best efforts to achieve organizational goals. Such a reason for calendar change is of questionable merit. Administrative convenience is also a reason for change in other instances.

The change of an academic calendar should be a means of implementing educational policy based on a sound, acceptable educational philosophy. The calendar should be viewed as an educational instrument to serve as a means to particular ends, rather than as an end in itself. Educational policy should determine the calendar rather than to be determined by it. Experience with the work of regional accrediting agencies sometimes reveals glaring gaps between the avowed statements of institutional mission, goals, and objectives and some of the means extant, such as academic calendar, for accomplishing them.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the relationship between the academic calendar and collegiate summer schools and/or summer sessions. Literature and research on summer activities have previously avoided attention to academic calendars, and the literature and research on calendars is virtually devoid of attention to summer activities.

Historical Background

In England, Oxford and Cambridge Universities operated on a four-term academic calendar. The terms were named Hilary, Easter, Trinity, and Michelmas after old church festivals. When Harvard College was established in America in 1636, instruction was provided over the twelve months with all students pursuing the same studies throughout the entire year. The year was divided into four terms, and these terms of approximately the same length were called quarters. Morison described the situation, ". . . instead of having the gracious names of the old church festivals they were simply designated by number. Harvard 'quarters' were simply fiscal divisions . . . for college kept continuously, and residence toward a degree was counted in years."[1]

The last day of each quarter was known as quarter day when students were presented with quarter bills that had to be paid within a month. College laws of 1825 still spoke of four quarters, but in 1826, there was mention of three terms and term bills. However, Cowley indicated that the four-term plan had continued at Harvard from its founding until 1801 when the faculty adopted a three-term system. He found it incredible that Harvard's calendar did not influence the calendar of other colonial colleges.[2] Since as Morison indicated, the division of the year was primarily for fiscal reasons, this fact does not surprise the authors. It is, therefore, a myth that Harvard pioneered a curriculum quarter; that action waited for the University of Chicago to take upon its founding in 1892. Other colonial colleges operated on a three-term calendar of approximately 10 months duration, and this calendar was the dominant one among collegiate institutions until the mid-1800s. William and Mary College, founded in 1693, probably introduced the three-term plan.[3]

The adoption of the three-term plan among early colleges can be understood by the fact that large percentages of students spent part of the year teaching. As children were needed on the farms during planting and harvesting periods, they were able to attend school only during winter months. Thus college calendars accommodated the need to provide teachers for the rural schools that had been expanding rapidly. This may have been the reason Harvard switched from four to three terms in 1801. Instead of winter vacation lasting five weeks, under the new plan, it lasted eight weeks. Educational historians stress the significance to early colleges of the teaching done by their students during winter months. The idea of the three-term calendar obviously took root because it fitted best into the economic conditions of the times.

As the educational and social consciousness was awakened toward the end of the first quarter of the 1800s and desire of the American populous for professional and practical education related to the secular affairs of life heightened, the vast expansion of public high schools and academies made it possible for greatly increasing numbers of students to enter college. Calendars of the academies and high schools accommodated an agrarian economy by allowing students to work during late spring, summer, and early fall months. Collegiate institutions, probably beginning with Princeton University in 1823, became concerned about articulating their academic calendars with those of the secondary schools. This was especially true after 1865 when the public high school development spread rapidly. Thus, the two-term or semester calendar became dominant and traditional. The traditional first semester usually began the middle to latter part of September and ended toward the end of January, and the second semester usually began in early February and ended during the first half of June.

Although the traditional semester academic calendar was used by most institutions (over three-fourths) by 1965, many calendar changes were made within the following decade, including the appearance of early semester, trimester, 4-1-4 and other modular time configurations.[4]

Trends in Types of Academic Calendars

In the school year 1957-58, a planning committee at the University of Michigan obtained information from 923 collegiate institutions about their academic calendars.[5] Included were colleges, universities, teachers colleges, and professional schools with different size enrollments. Of all institutions, 84 percent were on a semester calendar and 16 percent were on a quarter system. Data are shown below from several studies which reveal a trend in academic calendars.[6]

Year	Traditional Semester	Early Semester	Quarter	Trimester	4-1-4	Other
1967-68	64%	9%	19%	4%	1%	3%
1670-71	36%	27%	22%	3%	8%	4%
1973-74	12%	43%	24%	3%	14%	4%
1976-77	7%	48%	24%	3%	13%	5%
1981-82	5%	55%	25%	1%	10%	4%
1985-86	4%	55%	26%	2%	7%	6%

One can observe that there was a marked decline in the use of the September-June traditional two-semester calendar and a marked increase in the early semester calendar the first term of which begins in mid-August and ends just before Christmas; the second term begins in January and ends in May. Typically, the quarter calendar is one in which the academic year is divided into three 12-week segments with summer session functioning as the fourth quarter. However, a variation of this system is where the summer quarter is developed as an academic quarter equivalent to any other quarter term offered throughout the year.

The 4-1-4 calendar usually consists of two, four-month terms divided by a mid-winter (usually January) one-month term.[7] The pioneer colleges to implement this calendar were Florida Presbyterian College in St. Petersburg (1960-61) and Colby College in Waterville, Maine (1961-62). By 1970, 97 institutions, predominately small independent and church-related residential liberal arts colleges and universities, had implemented the 4-1-4 plan.

At Reed College and a few other colleges, the January interterm is used for non-traditional creative educational activities. Undergraduate students teach classmates subjects ranging from computer skills, western civilization and Swahili to telemark skiing, public health, bartending, Shogi, and pizza making. Other colleges using the interterm in creative ways are Amherst College, Hampshire College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, and the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.[8]

The trimester calendar, the least popular, is one in which the year is divided into three terms of about 16 weeks each. This calendar was used first by the College of William and Mary in 1693 and was widely accepted until the end of the nineteenth century. It reappeared briefly during World War II and in 1959, this academic calendar was with considerable publicity heralded by the

University of Pittsburg as one that institutions might emulate. While there were advantages as there are for any academic calendar plan, there were also serious disadvantages which caused institutions such as the Florida public universities and the City Colleges of Chicago to abandon the system soon after inaugurating it. Chief among the disadvantages were faculty dissatisfaction with loss of research time, salary adjustments, and difficulty in arranging exchange positions at institutions with semesters, problems in scheduling intercollegiate athletics, increased load and increased pace of work for administrators, and inability to balance enrollments among the three terms. Not the least in importance for the demise of this academic calendar plan was the extreme difficulty of mustering both external political and social support and internal support of primary participants.[9]

There are about as many time modular configurations as one's imagination could create, and one of them has been the 3-3-3 calendar. Nearly two dozen institutions experimented with this calendar in which the academic year is divided into three terms in which students enroll in three courses each term. This and other modular plans permit intensive instruction in fewer courses as a mode of teaching and learning with increased responsibility on the part of the student for learning.[10] Hiram College in Ohio implemented between 1934 and 1958 one of the most recognized early plans for intensive courses. However, the Williamston Female College in South Carolina operated on such a plan from 1877 to 1909. The Hiram College academic calendar was four quarters of nine weeks each. While the 8-9 a.m. hour was reserved for running courses such as foreign languages, the time from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. was spent with students studying intensely one subject with physical education and/or recreation squeezed into the late afternoon period. Chapman College in California later adopted such a plan. Under the direction of Dr. Eileen Kuhns, Mount Vernon College in Washington, D.C. adopted a ten-term, three-week intensive instruction plan with a two or three-day break between terms.

An interesting plan adopted by Colorado College in Colorado Springs in the 1969-70 year was designed to capture the advantages of intensive single course instruction and yet provide time necessary to learn some kinds of subjects through the offering of concurrent courses. The calendar consisted of nine terms averaging three and one-half weeks separated by four and one-fourth day breaks. Some courses occupied one or sometimes up to three terms, concurrent courses demanding considerable time for absorption being offered two at a time over three terms, and adjunct courses in dance, music, and other skills being offered along-side the others.

It was the privilege of this author to have been a member of the planning team for the establishment of Evergreen State College in Olympia, Washington, which implemented an opposite variation of the intensive idea. With the abandonment of the idea of fragmented courses as such, students devote the entire academic year to the consideration of a single major theme or problem. Such themes, for example, have been human ecology, mind and body, life on earth, and learning about past and present. In this system, as many as five professors and approximately one hundred students devote the year to analyzing such topics using a series of large and small group meetings, seminars, readings, and projects on as well as off campus. This plan seeks to provide year-long coherence for its students' learning through these extended but intensive courses rather than to compress information from single courses into a series of unrelated segments of a few weeks duration.

Other calendar term variations are 4-4-1, 4-0-4, and 4-4-2. There also have been 10-3-10-10, 12-12-6, 14-4-14, 15-4-15, 15-5-15-8, and 16-3-16 week calendars. Through the years, a number of hybrid systems of academic terms of varying lengths have been used. There is also the possibility of reverting to the early Harvard pattern of having one term per year with all subjects being year-long. Although deviations from customary calendar patterns may cause articulation problems with other schools and problems of faculty and student adjustments, calendar flexibility should not be overlooked as a means for accomplishing paramount educational aims.

Factors Influencing Academic Calendars

During national emergencies created by both world wars, agencies of the United States government appealed to collegiate institutions for manpower training assistance related to the war effort. Many institutions established year-around calendars of instruction to assist in this effort and as soon as possible afterwards reverted to nine-month calendars of operation. The unsung contributions of collegiate institutions in accommodating the needs of national emergencies for manpower training should not go unnoticed, for this type of external pressure has certainly affected academic calendars for temporary periods of time in the interest of National Defense. In 1917, representatives of 200 higher education institutions assembled in Washington, D.C. by the Council of National Defense recommended a four-quarter plan as a means of more fully utilizing their plants, faculties, and students in the war effort. A large number of institutions subsequently made the change, but after the war, few remained on either a four-quarter or three-semester system.[11] There was a pronounced shift to the four-quarter system during World War II from 8.3 percent to 14.7 percent of degree granting institutions.[12] For a while during the late 1940s, many universities and colleges operated full institutional programs throughout the summer to accommodate the influx of veterans enrolling under the Veterans Readjustment Act.

Toward the end of the 1950s and the early 1960s, interest in academic calendars heightened to new peaks for reasons quite unrelated to educational aims or methods. The impending and projected enrollment growth made clear the need to accommodate record numbers of students. This condition resulted from the post-war baby boom. Desire for college education was accentuated by the snow-ball effect stemming from opportunities military veterans had enjoyed and their heightened ambition for their children's education. Academic planners were concerned about how to accommodate increased enrollments with a minimum of physical facility expansion and the increasing costs and indebtedness that would entail.

The rising age at which young professionals were able to begin practice was another long-term social concern which had an impact on academic calendar planning. During the last decade of the 1800s, discussion had ensued about this matter. Philosophically speaking, Eliot expressed in 1892 before the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association the notion that, "The whole school life should be one unbroken flow from one fresh interest and one new delight to another, and the rate of that flow ought to be different for each different child."[13] He was concerned about shortening and enriching the grammar school course. Slightly more than a decade later, in 1911, the National Education Association created the Committee on the Economy of Time, whose primary attention was to effect an economy of time through the employment of scientific methods in curriculum revisions.[14]

The interested scholar can find in the literature of higher education many references to expressed concerns and experiments designed to accelerate student progress through college and professional training, thus reducing the time required before entering upon practice. It would serve no purpose to detail these here; suffice it to indicate that as a persistent interest of long-standing, this concern has impacted academic calendar planners. Notable among the efforts since Harvard College began with a three-year college pattern for the bachelor's degree have been such efforts by other institutions. Some examples are the University of Virginia which in 1819 introduced a three-year plan that was abandoned in the 1850s due to hardships the long schedule imposed on working class families. Others were experiments introduced at the Universities of Michigan, Minnesota, and Georgia, which were soon killed by faculty opposition. The Johns Hopkins University program from 1876 to 1907 was three years long as was the program at Clark University from 1902 to 1922.[15] At the beginning of the 1960s era of renewed interest in academic calendars, Kirk outlined for general public consumption the development of a three-year college calendar pattern.[16] Stickler indicated that, while the standard academic calendar was 32-36 weeks, there was debate in the 1960s about year-round calendars of 40-48 weeks per year to permit the completion of a bachelor's degree in three, rather than four, years.[17] The reasons advanced were to provide high quality education for increased numbers of students seeking college entrance, to achieve lower unit costs, and to facilitate maximum use of plant, staff, and financial resources. He pointed out that in the late 1940s, some collegiate institutions had been on a trimester calendar and for years dozens had operated on four full quarters. In 1965, he indicated 85 percent of American colleges and universities had semester academic calendars.

Undoubtedly, some of the modular calendar experimentation by non-public institutions with freedom to limit enrollments has been for educational and pedogogical purposes. One major institution, Dartmouth College, effected a calendar change in order to shift emphasis from teaching to learning with the aim of increasing a student's responsibility for his or her own education. A case study of that effort should be of interest to collegiate planners who view the academic calendar as an instrument of education and a means toward the facilitating paramount educational objectives.[18]

Year-Round Academic Calendars

Early in the 1960s and after a major study of academic calendars, McKenna described the status of collegiate academic calendars as, ". . . being in a state of transition between the traditional pattern of the nine-month academic year and the proposed full utilization of the academic year."[19] At that time, numerous experiments were underway designed to develop academic calendars that provided an efficient plan of operation. They involved the juggling of numbers of terms, weeks in a term, numbers of classes per week, numbers of subjects taken by students, and numbers of credit hours granted to students. During the fall and early winter months of the 1962-63 year, the academic calendars and plans of 116 large, comprehensive universities, including all state universities and other universities from the very largest in enrollments down to those having approximately 4,000 were studied. Calendar patterns and plans were inventoried and descriptions and analyses were presented of three major existing calendar plans along with a summary of reasons and conditions for year-around operation.[20]

Rationale for Year-Round Calendars

According to McKenna,[21] the major social pressures impinging upon collegiate institutions were the need to serve more students, to increase operational efficiency of the institution, and to improve the academic quality so as to remain educationally and technologically competitive.

Images influencing the development of rationale for year-round calendar operation are the numbers image (public demand for enlarged capacity), efficiency image (demand on administration for cost-effective operation), and quality image (demand on faculty for improved caliber of instruction). While each of these images influences the development of rationale for year-round calendar operation, these images have not been completely interrelated in the total purpose of higher education. Since the images have not been philosophically interrelated, they cannot be interrelated in practice.

Disparity among the images generate suspicions and countersuspicions among the public, administrators, and faculty about the motives for year-round planning. Consequently, the academic calendar and year-round operation become subjects of raging controversy among protective interests.

Rationale usually presented to the public reflecting the external problems facing higher education were enrollment expansions, growth of knowledge, and need for trained manpower. These rationale were (1) to serve larger numbers of students without proportionate increases in personnel and facilities, (2) the number of years could be reduced from four to three, (3) the manpower supply of talented specialists would be increased by graduating more students earlier, and (4) that demands for more extensive and intensive liberal and specialized education would be met. Rationale reflecting internal reasons and motives usually were (1) to improve the public image as an efficient, cost-effective operation to attract increased financial support, (2) to enhance the institution's competitive position by substantially increasing faculty salaries, and (3) to effect curriculum and administrative reorganization and change which usually accompanies changes in the academic calendar.

Educational reasons for a year-round calendar cited by Stickler[22] were:

1. More flexible means for coping with expansion of knowledge by putting more weeks of the calendar year to use.
2. Shortens the educational process for students in professional and graduate programs.
3. Generates greater student seriousness of purpose and reflects the view that time is a precious resource.

Administrative advantages also cited were:

1. Distributes overhead over a larger volume of educational accomplishments, thus reducing the unit costs.

2. Improved utilization of space.

3. Means to stretch use of faculty and staff resources.

4. Brings colleges and universities into step with the pace of national industrial and post-industrial life from the unhurried, leisurely academic life fostered by an agrarian society of yesteryear.

In spite of the arguments and rationale advanced for year-round calendars, some educators have voiced disadvantages. Most typical of them was expressed by Pressy after obtaining data on several means of student acceleration, including a lengthened school year, taking heavier than normal loads, credit by examination, and special classes or programs for superior students. His conclusion was that:

> . . . the lengthened school year appears unduly burdensome in rigorous professional programs such as medicine and engineering, and unfortunate for many students in other curriculums who need opportunities for off-campus experience often obtained during the summer. There may be, on the average, some cumulative fatigue affecting quality of work. However, the importance of this last factor appears exaggerated in most discussions of the subject. Many well-adjusted and mature individuals find the lengthened year an opportunity rather than a burden.[23]

Other disadvantages scattered throughout the literature relate to personal convenience matters of faculty and, without some equitable plan, the possibility of overload and extended periods between vacations.

Problems and Requirements

Changing an academic calendar is not a simple matter, for it entails planning for students, faculty, curriculum, plant, administration, and financing. To achieve full utilization of resources and efficiency through year-round operation presupposes some provision for equalized units of time, student enrollments, course offerings, faculty utilization, and physical plant use in each calendar unit. Conditions for optimum operation of year-round calendars were cited by Stickler. They were:

1. Interchangeable terms of equal length, character and status.

2. Equal numbers of admissions and enrollments every term.

3. Service to all levels of students through offering of full complement of courses and curricula every term.

4. Equitable use of faculty time and equal pay for equal periods of work.

5. Equalized physical plant utilization.

6. The program should be a single, integrated, unified one throughout the year.

Henderson, formerly President of Antioch College, corroborated some of these views when he cited conditions essential to the operation on a year- round basis. He indicated those conditions included the securing of additional finances needed, agreement between the faculty and administration as to the plan and its method of operation, and preplanning with students the periods they will attend.[24]

A major problem in the implementation of a year-round calendar has been that institutions have sought to equalize time units without adequate research and planning for equalizing other operational components, such as enrollments, curricular offerings, faculty services, and plant use. Inability to equalize and to predict enrollments either by attraction or regulation presents a problem. Faculty welfare, expectations, and deep-seated attitudes and habits have not been adequately considered in calendar change by administrators who typically propose such changes.[25] Concerning problems of year-round operation, Henderson said, "The problem that looms the largest is often that of changing peoples' attitudes."[26]

Stickler referred to the American habit of attending college in the winter, but not in the summer as an American Folkway. In this context, he said the, "Most important obstacle currently militating against year-round operation is student and faculty apathy if not outright resistance to attending college during the summer session."[27] To cope with this situation, some colleges and universities have established regulations of various kinds mandating summer term attendance as a prerequisite for completing degree requirements. With the changing economic scene, and for other reasons too, some institutions have found it prudent to drop such requirements. For example, Colgate University abandoned in 1982 a mandatory requirement implemented in 1973 that students enroll for a summer in place of a fall or spring term.[28] The reduction in Federal aid could make it difficult for some students to attend three consecutive terms. In comparison with the 1973 year, additional student housing had been developed and could more adequately accommodate the full enrollments during fall and spring terms. In the early 1960s, McKenna predicted that, ". . . an academic calendar designed for full-scale, year-round operation will not be painlessly absorbed into the system of American higher education."[29] He predicted that until such time as the regulated planning required for year-round operation can be achieved, the academic calendar will remain in transition.

Search for the Best Calendar

Most calendar studies prior to the early 1960s assumed students and staff would continue in an academic year of about nine months and, therefore, any summer session involved would be a subsidiary term. Exceptions are the periods of military conflict in World Wars I and II. Some studies during the late 1950s and 1960s assumed the college year ought to be extended to eleven or twelve months. A major argument for a year-round operation was that it made possible and encouraged a fuller commitment to the central task of education on the part of both faculty and students.

The primary search seems to have been for a calendar that would encourage more effective learning on the part of students and be effective for faculty. Needs of these two groups raise questions of how long terms should be, when they should begin and end, what the course structure should be, and what the provisions should be for examinations, recess or vacation periods, housekeeping chores, and athletic schedules. After carefully studying the advantages and disadvantages of collegiate calendars, both the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers Committee on the University Calendar and McKenna concluded that no one calendar gives the best answer.[30] In fact, McKenna expressed the view that, since there was a lack of research evidence that one calendar system was educationally superior to another, it was probably better for an institution to hold on to the present system with whatever disadvantages it has rather than to suffer unforeseen complications of radical change. These utterances corroborated those of Cowley thirty years earlier who, after examining for an Ohio State University committee the relative merits of the quarter versus semester systems stated, "It might be supposed that after three centuries of experimentation one of these four methods of organization of the college year (four term, three term, two-term semester, and quarter systems) would have emerged as superior to the others, but the ideal calendar, strangely enough, continues in not a few institutions to be a moot and perplexing problem."[31] After a thorough and systematic study of the relative merits of both the semester and quarter plans, evidence indicated that for Ohio State University, the quarter plan was the most desirable. However, a caution was given that findings with respect to the quality of instruction, effectiveness of examinations, the better plan for the student body and instructional staff, administrative efficiency, and the success and quality of the summer session should not be interpreted as applying to other institutions, although the conclusions reached might be suggestive to other faculties.

After analyzing ideal mathematical models for year-round operation, Easton found that the trimester calendar provided the greatest increase in student capacity, the highest efficiency of operation, and the lowest cost. These benefits presumed three equal size entering classes per year and held true whether some students were accelerated or whether all attended two terms of the three on a staggered basis. These conditions held so long as it was predictable which system a student would follow.[32] Compared to a semester system, Cowley's earlier findings were that the vast majority of departments offered more work in the summer quarter than they were able to offer in the summer session of a semester system, and that more students were able to obtain master's degrees by taking all their work through successive summer quarters than under the shorter summer session of a semester system. He also reported that all colleges had a larger percentage of their regular enrollment continuing during the summer under the quarter system than under the semester system. No arguments could be mustered for summer session under a semester system.[33]

It is not the intent or purpose here to detail the pros and cons of different calendar systems, for the reader can find those well stated by reviewing the last three reference works cited herein. The "best" calendar for a given institution is probably whatever it says it is.

Relationship of Collegiate Calendar to Summer Session

Although the University of Chicago had an important influence upon collegiate calendar planning, of equal importance was the war-time approval given by the United States Government to the quarter plan. Some of the institutions making the conversion in times of national emergency remained on the quarter plan, but most reverted to a semester plan later. While in the late 1940s, some had been on the trimester and dozens for years had operated on the four full quarter plan, Stickler generalized the circumstances before 1960 regarding summer sessions. He said, ". . . summer sessions have been academic appendages. Characteristically, they have not been an integral part of the school-year calendar."[34] He described them as being of usually less duration than other terms, with sharply limited curriculum offerings (sometimes fragmented), with limited enrollments of 1:5 to 1:3 ratios to other terms, and serving a markedly different clientele (older, graduate students and teachers, and an absence of undergraduate students). He said, ". . . the two semester-plus summer-session plan is not a full-blown year-round calendar."[35] Summer sessions he contended are generally different by being shorter, different emphasis, curtailed curriculum, absence of many regular faculty in residence, reduced enrollments, different types of students, and lack articulation fully with the regular program. He indicated that although students can possibly earn the baccalaureate degree in three years and meets 40 or more weeks per year, the overall program lacks integration and cohesiveness.

Little of the research on college and university calendars since Cowley's study has given attention to the nature and quality of summer educational activities. On the other hand, conspicuous by its absence in the research on summer sessions is recognition of the close relationship between activities fostered during summer periods and the collegiate calendar which sets the framework within which anything educational happens, including the summer months. A 1985 study of all colleges and universities in the United States classified by Carnegie type as Research, Doctoral Granting, or Comprehensive revealed that in 26 percent of the institutions participating, the summer session was an integral part of the year-round operation and of coordinate or equal rank with other academic terms. In two-thirds of the institutions, the summer session was separate from the regular academic term.[36]

While research studies on summer sessions and data for the Summer Sessions Association Joint Statistical Reports have tended to pool information, regardless of institutional calendar, results have been little better than comparing apples and peanuts. The two kinds of summer educational activities are different, depending upon the philosophical, financial, and educational commitments of a collegiate institution. Notwithstanding the enthusiasm and entrepreneurial skill of administrators and directors in institutions where summer-time activities are considered in every way an appendage and separate from the mainstream educational mission, there is a fixed limit and constraint to the breadth, depth, and probable quality that can be achieved in summer period educational programs.

Summer Term Calendars

The impending sharp increase in collegiate enrollments for the 1960s decade excited interest in modifying the two-term semester and the less frequently found three-term quarter traditionally adhered to by most American institutions.

Regardless of the growth of new calendar plans, by 1960 most American colleges offered the standard short summer session. The 6-week main term remained the most popular and found in 44.2% of all four-year institutions; next most popular were 8-week main terms in 16.1%. Five-week terms were found in 15.6% of the four-year institutions, and one to four week terms were operated by 10.4%. Of the four-year institutions, 6.4% had sessions of ten or more weeks. Two percent operated seven-week terms, and 5.3% had 9-week main sessions. Most types of institutions generally followed this sequence with the exception of liberal arts colleges where second in incidence of popularity to the 6-week main term were terms of 5-week duration (19%) and 8-week duration (13.7%). Sessions of ten or more weeks were favored by 52.4% of two-year technical institutes and semiprofessional schools, while 51% of the junior colleges favored the 6-week term with the 8-week term next most frequent (18.1%).

Most collegiate institutions favored the operation of one summer session term (44.6% four-year; 69% two-year). An additional 34.2% of the four-year colleges offered two summer terms as did 26.1% of the two-year colleges. Of the four-year institutions, about one-fifth (21.2%) offered three or more terms as did 4.9% of the two-year colleges. A 36.5% sample of responses revealed that 11.4% had distinct first summer terms and 9% had second terms, intersessions and postsessions, as differentiated by beginning and ending dates, or calendar spans. A review of opening and closing dates of summer session terms prompted the conclusion that in 1960 a person could, by careful selection, have enrolled in a summer session of almost any desired length from 2 to 17 weeks to suit their purposes and time limitations. A prospective student could have started a term within a day of almost any date they chose between May 30 and August 19, for there were 41 different beginning days scheduled.[37]

Twenty-four years later (1984), the 6-week summer term was found to be the term of highest enrollment in 29.7% of the 222 four-year institutions providing information for the Summer Sessions Association's Joint Statistical Report.[38] Five-week terms had the highest enrollment level in 25.2% of the institutions; 8-week and 4-week sessions each were the highest enrollment terms in 11.3%. Highest enrollment terms of one to three weeks duration were found in 9.5% of the institutions, and highest enrollment terms of nine or more weeks were found in 6.2%. Seven-week terms had the highest enrollment in 6.8%.

In 1984, the first summer terms began from April 23 to July 23. Most began between May 21 and July 25 (83.1%). A second summer term was offered by 91.6% of the institutions providing information, and they began from April 30 to August 13 with two-thirds of them opening between June 4 and July 16. Third terms were offered by 46.2% and most (63.3%) operated between June 4 and July16. Four terms were offered by 19.6%, and opening dates ranged from May 7 to August 13.

While data gathered for the 1984 report came from only 44.9% of the 514 institutions contacted and have inherent limitations, they reflect a continuing effort by collegiate institutions to preserve and expand flexibility of summer term configurations to accommodate the interests and time allotments for study by students. To the extent these data may reflect trends, it seems as though there has been more attention devoted in recent than former years to shorter multiple summer sessions than longer term single sessions. Provided this is a valid trend generally, it may reflect heightened marketing efforts by institutions in a period of declining enrollments.

Credit Standards

It would be an abrogation of responsibility to conclude a treatise about academic and summer term calendars without a discussion of credit ratios as standards for equating college and university academic credits. Regardless of the academic year or summer term time configurations, there are certain recommended procedures for measuring the total time requirement of students for an educational activity and converting the requirement into academic credits. As early as 1974, the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators sought to establish some uniformity by resolving that one semester hour of academic credit should require of the average student at least 15 lecture type class hours plus 30 hours of preparation.[39] This resolution recognized two components of the time-to-credit hour measurement, namely, in class lecture time and outside preparation or other class related work.

Normally, under either a semester or quarter calendar plan, one academic credit hour is equated with a lecture class period meeting for fifty minutes each of 16 and 12 weeks, respectively. A third component of time-to-credit hour measurement not accounted for in the resolution was non-lecture type class work such as occurs in laboratory and studio forms of instruction. Laboratory instruction that requires students to meet for two or three (practice varies) fifty-minute periods per week for 16 or 12 weeks, depending on whether the institution is on a semester or quarter calendar, is assigned one academic credit hour. Another form of instruction which simultaneously combines both lecture and laboratory, the studio form, is found in such fields as shop and technical, art, and music. Credit-hour ratios for these fields may be set between those of the other primary forms of instruction.

Quann has developed a clear and comprehensive definition in which all three components are considered. He said:

> Academic credit is a measure of the total time commitment required of a typical student in a particular course of study. Total time consists of three components: (1) time spent in class; (2) time spent in laboratory, studio, field work, or other scheduled activity; (3) time devoted to reading, studying, problem solving, writing or preparation. One quarter or semester credit hour is assigned in the following ratio of component hours per week devoted to the course of study: (1) lecture courses--one contact hour for each credit hour, two hours of outside work implied); (2) laboratory or studio course--at least two contact hours for each credit hour(one hour of outside preparation implied); (3) independent study--at least three hours of work per week for each credit hour.[40]

He stressed that the formulas could be used regardless of length of term and also applied to workshops and special sessions of less than one term duration. He indicated, for example, ". . . a one- or two-day workshop would normally not qualify as a one-credit offering unless there were sufficient required preworkshop study or postworkshop follow-up assignments equivalent to the additional hours of outside preparation implied in the above credit ratios."[41]

Questions for Pondering About Summer Sessions

Some intriguing questions arise. First, if the legislatures don't feel a commitment for the education of the kinds of students served in summer, why anyone in a public college or university should bother trying to operate a summer session of dubious quality on a shoestring, self-supporting budget? Those kinds of students are those who want to accelerate their progress, older citizens whose jobs do not permit them to attend during the fall, winter, and spring months, new students who want to get a head start in college, or married, military veterans who need to maintain constant progress toward educational objectives. Second, do collegiate institutions have a prime obligation to make summer jobs in order to retain faculty? Third, is it morally and ethically sound for an institution to view the summer period as a time for replenishing funds from summer students for other purposes with the hope that what happens during this quarter of the year will soon be forgotten by students who aren't regularly enrolled? Fourth, what is the rationale for summer session educational operations that are not considered either by the legislature or central administration as worthy of fostering a continuous educational program throughout the calendar year? Within the constraints and limitations imposed by a three-quarter or two-semester system, a fifth question could be what practices have been found effective? While some of the questions probably have no easy answers, it is to the last question that portions of the following chapters are devoted.

Summary

The need was cited for a collegiate calendar to be viewed as a means, not an end, to accomplish educational goals. A brief historical background and trends of calendar development were given, for these impact what summer sessions have been and can be. Various factors influencing academic calendar planning were identified and year-round calendars were discussed, for both influence directly the nature of university and college summer sessions. The quandary about which kind of calendar is best was discussed. The imperative need to view summer session or summer period educational activities in the context of an institution's academic calendar was stressed. The previous failure of either researchers of information about summer sessions or of researchers studying academic calendars to consider summer period educational activities was identified. It appears that summer educational activities in institutions organized on a year-round basis are considerably different, and should be considered so by researchers, than summer sessions or activities in institutions which consider them as educational, philosophical, and financial appendages or orphans. The former summer terms tend to be like any other term in the year, but the latter tend to differ in amount of tuition charged, administrative and financial arrangements, status, scope and type of curriculum offerings, length of term, and nature of students served.

Chapter 8 -- Endnotes

1. Samuel E. Morison, Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), 56. See also Samuel E. Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard: 1636-1936 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936).

2. William H. Cowley, A Study of the Relative Merits of the Quarter and Semester Systems, Report of Faculty Committee Approved by Faculty and Board of Trustees of the Ohio State University (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1932), 4.

3. Ibid., 5-6.

4. Loyd C. Oleson, "Academic Calendars." In A. S. Knowles (ed.), International Encyclopedia of Higher Education, Volume 3 (San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publications, 1977), 767-771. (For a good explanation of the 4-1-4 plan, see this reference.)

5. Paul S. Dwyer, Report of the University Calendar Study Committee (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, June 1958), 69.

6. Data for the period 1967-68 to 1976-77 were adapted from C. James Quann and Associates, Admissions, Academic Records, and Registrar Services (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications, 1979), 274; data for 1981-82 were estimated from a graph by Maria Rudensky, "Early Semester Calendars Found Most Popular," The Chronicle of Higher Education, 23 (17 February 1982):3; and data for 1985-86 were from American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Data Dispenser, 5(4) (December 1985):4.

7. For an extensive description of the 4-1-4 term calendar, see Oleson, Loc. Cit. and Charles E. Angell, "A Study of the Origin and Development of the 4-1-4 Undergraduate College Program with Special Consideration for the Interim Term," Ed. D. dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1969.

8. Thomas J. Meyer, "On Some Campuses, January is a Month for Students to Instruct Their Classmates," The Chronicle of Higher Education, 20 (29 January 1986):21-22.

9. Richard L. Desmond, "The Enigmatic Trimester Calendar," Educational Record 52 (Fall 1971):371-376.

10. J. B. Hefferlin, "Intensive Courses--An Old Idea Whose Time for Testing Has Come," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 6 (Fall 1972):83-98.

11. William H. Cowley, A Study of the Relative Merits of the Quarter and Semester Systems, 52; Edgar E. DeCou, "The Three-Term Versus the Two-Semester Plan in the Summer Session," School and Society, 11 (28 February 1920):261-62.

12. U.S. Office of Education, "Accelerated Programs in Degree-Granting Colleges and Universities" by Ellen Winston and Maude Farr (Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education, n.d.), 1-4; Hugh W. Stickler, "The College Calendar: What Kind of School Year." In Samuel Baskin (ed.), Higher Education: Some Newer Developments (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1965), 224.

13. Charles W. Eliot, Educational Reform: Essays and Addresses (New York: The Century Company, 1898), 268.

14. Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934), 544-45.

15. Committee on the University Calendar of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, The University Calendar (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1961), 5-6.

16. Grayson Kirk, "College Shouldn't Take Four Years," The Saturday Evening Post 232 (26 March 1960):111.

17. Hugh Stickler, "The College Calendar: What Kind of a School Year?" In Samuel Baskin, Higher Education: Some Newer Developments, 223-245.

18. See The University Calendar for a good case study of the Dartmouth experience.

19. David L. McKenna, "The Academic Calendar in Transition," Educational Record, 43 (January 1962):68.

20. Committee of the Association of University Summer Session Deans and Directors, Year-round Operation in American Universities (Boulder, Colorado, 1963), 19-29; 35-43.

21. McKenna, op. cit., 68-75.

22. Hugh W. Stickler, "The College Calendar: What Kind of a School Year?" In Samuel Baskin (ed.), Higher Education: Some Newer Developments, 223-245.

23. Sidney L. Pressy, Educational Acceleration, Appraisals and Basic Problems, Bureau of Educational Research Monograph 31 (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1949), 131-132.

24. Algo D. Henderson, "A Critical Look at Year-Round Operations of Institutions," Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, 1962), 161-164.

25. McKenna, op. cit.

26. Henderson, op. cit., 164.

27. Stickler, op. cit., 243.

28. Chronicle of Higher Education, 23 (10 February 1982):3.

29. McKenna, op. cit., 75.

30. Committee on the University Calendar, The University Calendar, 2; McKenna, op. cit., 74-75.

31. William H. Cowley, A Study of the Relative Merits of the Quarter and Semester Systems, 3.

32. Elmer C. Easton, Year-Round Operation of Colleges, Engineering Research Bulletin No. 41 (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University, 1958).

33. Cowley, op. cit., 42.

34. Stickler, op. cit., 224.

35. Ibid., 230.

36. Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall, Recent Changes in Summer Sessions of U.S. and Canadian Colleges and Universities (St. Louis: North American Association of Summer Sessions, 1985), 13.

37. U.S. Office of Education, Summer Sessions in Colleges and Universities of the United States, 1960, by Donald F. Warner, et al. Circular No. 700. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963), 17-19.

38. Lewis C. Butler, 1984 Summer Sessions Associations Joint Statistical Report. Alfred, New York: Alfred University, 1984, 5-6.

39. Elbert H. Himes, WASSA: A History (Logan, Utah: Office of Summer Sessions, Utah State University, 1973), 38.

40. C. James Quann and Associates, Admissions Academic Records, and Registrar Services, 192.

41. Ibid.

CHAPTER 9

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS FOR SUMMER SESSION ADMINISTRATORS

Introduction

The professionalization of the position of summer term administration as manifested by the development of associations or organizations devoted to the enhancement of skills to cope better with problems inherent in the job and to improve quality of services is of relatively recent origin. For several decades, after summer sessions became a legitimate part of college and university operations, persons designated to administer summer terms struggled along without the benefits of interinstitutional communication on a broad base or the assistance of in-service training based on the experience of others with more tenure. Often the lonely task was performed on a trial and error basis without the stimulation of shared experiences with others having similar responsibilities in other institutions or knowledge of conditions elsewhere, except possibly within a few other institutions where fate had dictated that an acquaintance or friend was assigned a similar responsibility.

It was only after decades during which summer sessions or terms were perceived as having second class citizenship in the institutions and administrators were accorded a wide range of hierarchical status by central administrative officers that summer term administrators sought to collectively upgrade their work through formalized professional association. In contrast to other types of administrative work, such as the president, administrator of academic, business, or student affairs, admissions officer, or registrar, the responsibility of summer session administration has been blurred by the part-time nature of the position. Whereas professional organizations emerged which catered to the interests of other types of full-time administrative personnel in higher education, this type of action relevant to the interests of summer term administrators, most of whom served in this capacity on a part-time basis, was slower in coming. In this section is a brief account of the major summer session organizations in which both Canadian and U.S.A. summer session directors participate.

Association of University Summer Sessions

The Founding

The first gathering of summer session administrators took place November 23-24, 1917 in Ann Arbor, Michigan. This meeting was the outgrowth of initiative taken by Edward H. Kraus, University of Michigan, George Bristol, Cornell University, and S. H. Goodnight, University of Wisconsin. On September 28, 1917, Dr. Kraus, Dean of Summer Sessions at the University of Michigan expressed to the other two men his idea that it would be very helpful if there could be an annual meeting of the executive officers of larger summer sessions around the country for the informal discussion of the various problems which were constantly confronting them.[1] He alluded to the fact that registrars and directors of extension held regular meetings and, if the idea appealed to them, such a gathering could be held in early November or late in October. Kraus asked them if they would ". . . be willing to join with me in issuing a call for the first meeting? Obviously, the place of meeting should be as central as possible, and naturally I would be glad to have the first meeting in Ann Arbor, which is midway between the East and the West."[2] He asked for their suggestions concerning a place for the meeting and for a list of institutions they thought should be invited to attend. Goodnight responded by listing 25 institutions. Those institutions were:

Boston University
California University
Colorado University
Columbia University
Cornell University
New York University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
Dartmouth University
Harvard University
University of Illinois
Indiana University
University of Kansas

University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
University of Montana
The University of Michigan
Johns Hopkins University
Syracuse University
University of Nebraska
University of Oklahoma
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin
University of Pennsylvania
University of Chicago

Dr. Goodnight suggested that invitations be limited to institutions where graduate work is offered during the Summer Session. He felt this would include all of the larger eastern institutions and the principal state universities which with the University of Chicago would make 25. He doubted that more than 15-18 would attend.[4] The same day, Kraus notified President H. B. Hutchins, University of Michigan that Bristol, Goodnight and he were issuing invitations to directors and deans of summer sessions of 25 universities ..." to attend a meeting for the purpose of discussing some of the many problems concerning summer session administration."[5] A circular letter was issued by Kraus, Goodnight, and Bristol calling a meeting in Ann Arbor for November 16-17 ". . . solely for the promotion of a better understanding and the solution, if possible, of the various problems involved in summer session administration which are constantly confronting us."[6] After it was determined that the dates selected would not fit some schedules, invitations were issued calling a meeting for November 23 and 24.

The three planners forwarded a letter to Harry Pratt Judson, President, University of Chicago acknowledging that while they knew summer session there was a regular quarter, they would like to invite a representative anyway. President Judson named Dean Rollin D. Salisbury, graduate School of Science as their representative.[7] A few days later, Kraus sought Goodnight's judgment as to what would constitute a sufficiently large number of representatives for a meeting and expressing doubt that more than twelve would come.[8] In spite of the apparent concern over how many would come for the gathering, delegates from fourteen universities arrived.[9] They were:

Boston University, A.H. Rice
Columbia University, J.C. Egbert
University, W.D. Howe
University, J.E. Lough
Northwestern University, C.S. Marsh
Ohio State University, M.B. Evans
Syracuse University, M.E. Smith

University of Chicago, R.D. Salisbury
University of Illinois, K.C. Babcock Indiana
University of Kansas, F.J. Kelly New York
University of Minnesota, L.D. Coffman
University of Wisconsin, S.H. Goodnight
University of Michigan, E.H. Kraus and
T.E. Rankin

Topics for discussion were:

1. Best ways of obtaining publicity.
2. The status of graduates in summer session.
3. What courses should be eliminated from the 1918 summer session.
4. Registration in 1916 as compared with 1917.
5. How the summer school may be of service to the country in the present crisis.

The informal gathering of delegates concluded with the decision to form a permanent organization, and thus was born The Association of Summer Session Directors. Kraus was elected chairperson and Lough secretary for the meeting whose terms would carry over to the second meeting tentatively planned for 1918 in New York City at the joint invitation of Columbia University and New York University. As a consequence of the last discussion item listed above, a committee of three was appointed to consult with the Education Committee of the National Defense to determine ways summer sessions could be of benefit to the country in the war-time crisis and what specific courses might be introduced. A letter to J. L. McConaughy of Dartmouth expressing regrets he could not be present summed up the first meeting when Kraus stated, "The gathering was very successful, fourteen institutions being represented. The discussions were all interesting and spirited, and it was agreed to meet again next year in New York at the corresponding time."

Regarding the first meeting, an important precedent was reported set as to the mode of operation. Although the gathering had been announced as an informal discussion meeting, when the meeting began, one of the members rose to speak. It has been reported that K. C. Babcock from the University of Illinois told chairman Kraus, "Don't let him stand--he will make a speech and if they begin making speeches, the organization will not be a success."[12] Kraus did not permit the speech, thus establishing the characteristic of informality which has persisted in the association.

Developments to 1945

There were at least two polite explanations why the planned 1918 meeting did not occur. One was that federal authorities advised against any travel, especially by railroad because of the necessity of moving freight,[13] and the other was, ". . . that owing to the very unsettled conditions prevailing the following year, no meeting was held last fall."[14] Correspondence indicated the real reason was procrastination on determining a date and mixed signals about who had what kind of responsibility for calling the meeting.

Thirteen institutions were represented at the second meeting, where a wide range of topics was discussed, and two decisions important to the future of the organization were made. One decision was to establish a foreign lectureship in which six institutions would cooperate and contribute toward the expense of bringing an English lecturer of distinction to spend a week at each institution. A second decision was to develop a plan for a uniform method of reporting summer session statistics which would permit comparisons among member institutions concerning summer sessions. The plan for the latter, adopted in 1920, encouraged cooperation among the member institutions, and material contained in annual reports has provided a continuous record of summer sessions development.[15] In 1921, the first unified statistical report on summer sessions financial expenses was issued by the association.

The annual gathering of the Association of Deans and Directors of Summer Sessions after 1919 was a loosely knit and informal group until 1925 when the first constitution was adopted by the membership from thirty-three universities, including the University of Toronto. The indefinite and vague purpose of considering matters of common interest relating to the university summer sessions avoided commitment to specific positions of the group concerning the administration of summer sessions. The group affirmed its commitment to the offering of graduate work in summer and established criteria for membership based principally upon the amount of genuineness of graduate work conducted during summer session. Institutional rather than individual membership was established, and if an institution was not represented at least once every three years at the annual meeting, it was to be dropped from membership. Prior to 1928, a university representative could petition for membership, but from that year no petitions were recognized and membership was by formal invitation only. Due to lack of attendance, Ohio State University, University of Pittsburgh, the George Peabody College for Teachers, and the state universities of Colorado, Oregon, and Oklahoma were dropped from membership in 1929. A membership ceiling of thirty-six members and four guests was imposed (Chautauqua University was a guest). While George Peabody College for Teachers was later readmitted in 1931, the University of Colorado was not, and based on the membership ceiling, membership was denied to the universities of Kentucky and West Virginia.

Fraught with enrollment declines and financial problems of the economic depression, members of the association in 1933 broke their previous stance on the passing of no resolutions, of adopting no position papers, or of not advocating policy. In that year, the group felt impelled to enunciate for the edification of university administrators the value of summer sessions, so they recommended that

> . . . provision be made for the recognition of the summer period as an integral part of the annual offering of the institution, with special regard to adequate financial support involving a proportionate allocation of the financial resources of the institution.[16]

In 1935, the group refused to adopt a resolution requesting the United States Commissioner to conduct a study of common denominators in summer session administration. The refusal was based on the group's policy of not taking a public position. A continuing membership committee was established to replace the practice of using ad hoc committees appointed for the purpose. A decision was made the following year after considerable discussion not to increase the size of the group for fear the meeting would become a convention with set papers and addresses and thus lose its value as an informal discussion forum of mutual problems. Concentrated attention was given in 1937 to the value of master's degree work in summer, and action to create an external committee having no relationship to the Association itself precipitated a study by the American Council on Education of the requirements of both the master's and doctor's degrees. From 1939 to 1941, the possibility of war and the role of summer session in preparing citizens for possible involvement, the defense and advancement of democracy, and the possibility of providing full-scale military training programs were matters of concern as well as such issues as attendance, student unrest, workshops, the feasibility of contingency contracts, and the value of summer work. Due to the war, except for a regional meeting attending by 12 representatives at the University of Michigan in 1943, there were no meetings of the Association in the years 1942, 1943, and 1944.

Post-World War II Meetings

After World War II terminated, the Association resumed their meetings with a reaffirmation to continue the informal discussion format, to avoid publicizing the discussions, and to refrain from adopting resolutions which not all members could support. In 1947, the Association agreed to limit its membership to forty. The name of the group was changed in 1949 to the Association of Summer Session Deans and Directors. The policy was reaffirmed that three consecutive absences of a representative constituted a forfeiture of membership by an institution. That institutions, not individuals, held membership was reaffirmed as was the desire of representatives for a complete but confidential record of meetings. Major topics of concern during the 1950s were the Korean War, enrollment decline, undergraduate requirements, role of the summer session dean or a director, payment plan for theses supervision, value of workshops, prediction of summer session attendance, basis for faculty salaries, conferences, and National Science Foundation programs. In 1959, a suggestion that future discussions be more concerned with questions of educational policy and less with those of administration resulted in the rejection of any attempt to change the informal discussion format and that there should not be any rapid change in the direction of the Association.

In 1960, the Association appointed a committee to work with the United States Office of Education to help officials of that office understand what happened in the 1960 summer sessions. This was the year the U.S. Office of Education conducted its first nation-wide, comprehensive study of summer sessions.[17] The following year, the association membership dispensed with keeping a stenographic record of meetings and inaugurated the maintenance of records which were somewhat briefer, nonstructured and limited accounts of events. A discussion of enlarging the membership resulted in a reaffirmation of the intent and desire not to become a national organization and destroy the value of the informal structure and discussion format. Major topics of concern continued to be objectives of summer sessions, year-round operations, promotion of summer study, compensation for visiting faculty, and faculty salaries and honorariums.

Birth of a New Organization

Writers of the 1925 Constitution intentionally omitted any provision for amendment for they intended the organization to be a closed one and remain as it was until such future time as there was need to dissolve the Association and start anew. In 1964 it was decided to reorganize again and revise the constitution. The new reborn organization was known as The Association of University Summer Sessions (AUSS). The former focus on graduate study was replaced by an enlarged focus on the mutual consideration of educational policy and administration peculiar to summer sessions. This reoriented focus was to be supported by research, data sharing, and annual deliberative meetings based in part on research documented position papers, a departure from the past. The membership limit was increased to fifty, and five committees were established of which one was a permanent membership committee. During the last one-half of the 1960s, major topics of concern were year-round operation, means of financing summer programming, faculty salaries, informal campus activities, no-show admissions, travel allowances for visiting faculty, budget, student unrest, student summer financial aid, summer sessions salary and contractual standards, and distinctive attributes and objectives of summer sessions. As the 1960s decade ended, the membership rejected the proposal that the word American should be added to preface the organizational name. The group also rediscovered the wisdom in not preparing and adopting position papers.

It was to preserve the informal format that membership was limited to 40 and later to 50 large universities having very substantial summer programs. Tables and chairs were arranged in a rectangular or square format with identification plaques in front of each participant so that all could see and hear at all times. Although the current president, usually the host, conducted the discussions, all members were free to contribute on all topics in free discussion. It was an extremely good arrangement for the members, but appeared to some non-member universities to be exclusive, thus contributing to the need for a more open national or continental type of organization available to all 4-year institutions.

Almost every year at least one major committee was formed and charged with responsibility for a study of one type or another with a report the following fall. An example of this type of activity was the 1963 Report to A.U.S.S. entitled "Year-Round Operation in American Universities" which was widely circulated by Dean John Little of the University of Colorado.[18] Other offshoots of AUSS may be found in many reports and papers including Year-Round Education by Schoenfeld and Schmitz of Wisconsin.[19] A number of articles written by affiliates followed and included such topics as "Acceleration," "Academic Planning," "The University Calendar," "Intensive Courses," "The Use of Facilities," and "Flexible Enrollment Plans." In addition, the expertise of members such as Clarence Schoenfeld of Wisconsin, Marion Marts of Washington, Robert Richey of Indiana, Gerald Marsh of California, William Owen of Columbia, and John Little of Colorado was brought to bear in consultation form and in numerous speeches and papers.

In 1985, there were forty-seven members of AUSS. All but five of the members also had membership in either the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators (WASSA), or the North American Association of Summer Sessions (NAASS). Purdue University had resigned in 1966 when the office of summer session director was abolished. The University of Michigan, currently a member, withdrew its membership that year because of adopting a trimester system which was to be short lived.

Western Association of Summer Session Administrators[20]

The Beginning

An informal gathering of fewer than ten summer session administrators from Rocky Mountain area colleges and universities was held at Western State College, Gunnison, Colorado in 1946. Thus began the Rocky Mountain Association. Each year participants met annually and were joined by representatives of a few more institutions as they learned of the meetings. In 1952, participants expressed a need to combine efforts in promotional activities designed to increase summer enrollments of teachers at their institutions. At the annual 1953 meeting in Provo, Utah, representatives of sixteen colleges and universities decided to share the expense of an advertisement in the National Education Association Journal, which would promote summer enrollment of teachers at those institutions. Although planning the joint advertisement was the principal agenda, representatives stayed on for an additional half-day discussion of mutual problems. In later years, meetings were extended to three, one-half day sessions.

Summer programs and enrollments developed rapidly in the Rocky Mountain region, and it became apparent that the year-round aspects of summer sessions were developing in such a fashion that promotional efforts could be reduced. Although the joint advertisement was discontinued in 1960, association members continued their annual meetings for mutual benefit, and participation varied from 15 to 24 institutions. Membership grew gradually as invitations were issued to representatives of institutions from states further west as they made inquiry. A number of California institutions sent representatives to the 1960 Reno, Nevada meeting, and each succeeding year additional West Coast area institutions were invited. Institutions in Canada indicated interest and became members after application.

Coming of Age

Before the 1962 meeting scheduled in Greeley, a committee was appointed to study Association purposes, need for name change, and geographical extent of membership. As a consequence, the name was officially changed at the 1963 meeting in Salt Lake City to the Western

Association of Deans and Directors of Summer Schools (WADDSS). A major objective of the association was to devote itself through sharing ideas at annual meetings and other communications to improving year-round aspects of summer programs and to the elimination of all possible differentials between the summer and other terms in the academic year except (1) term lengths, (2) essential supplementary and experimental programs, especially in summer, and (3) continuing education endeavors worthy of higher education.

There has been no fixed membership list, and members are from accredited four-year colleges and universities from the thirteen Rocky Mountain, West Coast, and Pacific states and including Western Canadian Provinces. All collegiate institutions in those areas have been welcome to attend and participate in the annual meetings. Annual meetings are set usually two years in advance with the membership accepting invitations from one or more institutions willing and desiring to host or co-host them. Summer session administrators of host institutions were responsible for developing and conducting the programs, for local arrangements, and for chairing the annual business meeting. Thus, there were no elected officers or standing committees. The structural informality proved to be one of the Association's most appealing assets. The only traditional features of the association were its informality and format of three one-half day sessions of lively discussion of practices, procedures, experiences, innovations, predictions, proposals, plans, and the sharing of statistical data believed essential to the program of the day. Regardless of the competitive and sometimes uncooperative attitudes held by other officials in their respective areas of work, participating summer session administrators have been completely and wholeheartedly cooperative and mutually helpful in the development of summer programs. With communication channels open, and as a result of acquaintances established through the association, many telephone calls were made between members as each faced new decisions in policy and practice.

The Association was kept informal and not rigidly structured. Programs varied widely in content, but they were left as unstructured as possible to allow for free discussion and unrestricted interchange of information. With the rapid growth in attendance and participation, the possibility and need for a more formal organizational structure was foreseen by Dr. John Little. Annual conference attendance between 1965 and 1970 had varied between 51 and 61. Membership ranged from 48 to 59 between 1968 and 1970, inclusive, the earliest years for which information is available.[21]

By the mid-1960s, the principal and most persistent concerns as reflected by the programs were the topics listed below.

Administration

1. The responsibilities of summer administrators.
2. Administrative and budgetary overlap with "The Year."
3. The administration of special events and conferences.
4. Annual reports: content and utilization.

Curriculum Programs

5. The content and scope of summer academic programs.
6. Short-term courses, workshops, institutes, intensive courses (credit and non-credit).
7. Supplementary--complementary programs in summer including lectures and concerts.
8. The development of balanced summer academic and activity programs.
9. Recreational programs: organization and contribution to the total program.
10. Evaluations of summer instruction by faculty and students.
11. Summer academic standards: equivalent or below those of "The Year"?

Staffing -- Faculty

12. Staffing the summer academic and non-academic programs.
13. Summer faculty salaries: equivalent or below those of "The Year"? How should faculty be paid?
14. The values of visiting faculty versus regular faculty.
15. Full-time faculty loads: how equated? What allowance is made for graduate student supervision and research?
16. Travel allowances for visiting summer faculty.

Public Relations -- Marketing

17. Methods and scope of publicizing summer programs externally and internally on-campus.
18. Faculty, administration and the public attitudes toward the status of summer sessions.

Students -- Admissions

19. Summer admission of beginning and transfer students and special programs for pre-university students.
20. Admission and registration procedures in summer.
21. Are student services adequate and equivalent to those in "The Year"?

22. Utilization of machine processes in record keeping.

Organization

23. Summer school as part of year-round programs.

24. The improvement of year-round aspects of summer instructional programs.

25. The college and university year-round calendar.

Finance

26. The financing of summer instruction: self-supporting or general fund.

27. Summer tuition and fees: on par with "The Year" or unequalized?

Miscellaneous

28. The need for and efforts toward uniform data on regional and national bases.

Advent of Formal Organization

At the 1966 conference chaired by Clarence Hines, a paper from which the foregoing history was extracted was presented by John R. Little, one of the founders and participants of the original annual get-together sessions. After presentation by Chairperson of the Committee on Constitution and By-Laws, Jackson Wells, University of Denver, a constitution was adopted. The informal group became a formal organization for the purpose of exchanging information regarding summer session programs and administrative practices. Membership is institutional with each member having one vote, and membership is open to accredited four-year colleges and universities located in the western part of the United States (Arizona, Alaska, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming) and Canada (Alberta, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan). Institutions located in all states of Mexico are eligible for membership. Institutions located in other areas of the United States and Canada who desire membership in the Association may be approved for membership by the Executive Committee.

A decision was made to put the Constitution in effect at the beginning of the 1967 conference in Las Vegas, and a Nominating Committee was formed consisting of Clarence Hines, University of Oregon, Willard Edwards, San Fernando Valley State College, John Morton, California State College at Los Angeles, and Jackson Wells, University of Denver.[22]

During 1973, in response to a 1972 proposal by Dean A. Peterson, President of WASSA and further support by succeeding President Richard Dankworth, Ellvert Himes, Utah State University Director of Summer Sessions prepared from minutes, reports, and personal files a history of the organization from where John R. Little left off in 1966.[23] With the 1966 adoption of a Constitution and By-Laws at Portland, Oregon there was a modification of the traditional conference format. Himes indicated that "The number in attendance and growing interest in reaching out for membership further influenced a more planned and orderly move from the informal, less structured characteristics of group meetings of the previous two decades."[24] John R. Little was elected the first President of the newly reformed organization in 1967, and Shunzo Sakamaki became President-Elect. Himes characterized the organization as up and running by 1968 and said, "The random movements of a loose-jointed, sometimes awkward, spontaneous effort of previous years were replaced by the well structured, directional activity of the constitution-inspired purposeful program."[25]

Considerable interest was generated among potential new members by the inauguration in 1967 of a workshop for administrators new to summer session administration. About a dozen administrators attended the first workshop, but in 1968 the group included twenty-two new and interested conferees.

In 1969, the Workshop for Administrators new to the job conducted by Ellvert Himes around a "little red schoolhouse" theme of the 3-Rs--Roles, Resources, and Reports--attracted 35 participants. At each conference, the longstanding practice was continued of having a display and presentation of sample summer term promotional materials and handouts from each member institution as kind of an idea exchange mart. That year work of President Little's ad hoc Research Committee had been directed toward obtaining useful data about summer sessions in the Western region. Officers made contact with officers of the National Association of Summer Sessions (NASS) to explore possibilities of combining interests and efforts of the several regional associations and the national association in developing a uniform questionnaire for collection of useful information about summer sessions. A recommendation made by Court Hotchkiss that WASSA and NASS have a joint meeting the following year was approved.

Under the leadership of NASS President-Elect Willard Edwards and WASSA President Ellvert Himes, the first joint annual meeting was planned and held in Portland, Oregon in 1970. The program theme was "Summer Student in the 70's." Joint meeting attendance ranged from 146 in 1970 to 188 in 1984. A WASSA Newsletter was begun in early 1970 to enhance mutual interest and communications.

Although a number of junior colleges were seeking membership, the organization reaffirmed its restriction of membership to four-year colleges and universities. A pilot survey study completed as a joint project as proposed in 1969 was reported on. The joining of hands between the two associations in 1970, which attracted 100 registrants and another estimated 50 wives and partners, was deemed to have been mutually beneficial. This practice has continued during years when the NAASS meetings were scheduled in western locations.

During the 1971 annual meeting, a resolution was presented authorizing the appointment of an Awards Committee to study innovative and creative Summer Session programs nominated by member institutions with a tangible award for the faculty member or administrator responsible for the program. This year marked the beginning of the WASSA University Simulation program conducted by Clayton Gjerde and Jack Blendinger. Summer session administrators assumed assigned roles on a President's Summer Advisory Committee. This role playing approach to problem solution dealt with a series of problems and gave participants experience in simulated problem solving. The simulation workshop was repeated in 1972 under direction of Jack Blendinger and Denis Kigin. For creative programming the first award was presented to Myrle Law, University of Utah. In 1973, the organization extended hands across the Canadian border and held the annual meeting in Banff where Denis Kigin was elected President. Faced with the energy crisis and legislative constraints, the influence of the summer session director as a prime mover to overcome obstacles and uncertain ties for success of the summer program served as a conference theme. Out of twenty-eight entries for creative programming, the senior citizens tuition-free program organized at the University of British Columbia by Norman Watt received the second award granted.

Because of concern about the threat to integrity of summer programs posed by the proclivity of some institutions to grant credit in excess of generally accepted standards, at the 1974 Conference in San Francisco the organization took a stand on the issue by establishing a set of principles. They were that summer programs should:

1. Conform to the standard that for the granting of one semester hour of credit, where an hour is used to identify units of credit, a student must devote 45 student hours (ordinarily 15 class hours plus 30 hours of preparation for the average student);
2. Adhere to the credit time standard criteria of item 1 above where program formats are based on competency or performance evaluations.

Program Emphases Since 1970

A review of general session topics since 1970 for annual conferences of WASSA reflects the variety and scope of concerns and interests of member summer session administrators in the western part of North America.[26] They were as follows:

Summer Session Relationships

New Developments in Higher Education for Minority Groups (1971).

How the Summer Session and the State Can Better Serve Each Other (1972).

How the Summer Session and the University Can Better Serve Each Other (1972).

Relationship of Summer Session to the Institutional Mission: Conflicts and Congruencies: Obstacles and Opportunities (1978).

The Challenge of Identity (1973).

Building an Image (1973).

An Accreditation View of Summer Session (1974).

The Impact of Summer Session on Higher Education (1975).

Programs and Programming

Critique of Summer Session 1976 Materials (1976).

Introducing Non-Traditional Programs Through Summer Session (1974).

An Introspective Analysis of Summer Study: What Are We Doing? How Are We Doing? (1977).

Administrative Strategies: Programming for the '80s (1979).

Profiles of Creative Summer Programs (1976).

A University President Looks at Special Sessions (1980).

Use of Microcomputers in the Summer Session: Making Waves in Program Development (1984).

Students/Consumers

Who's Educating the Student? (1970).

Summer Student in the '70s: His Aspirations, Fears, and Changing Environment (1970).

Changing Summer Session Publics (1973).

Women: Opportunities Unlimited (1975).

Operational Problems

Principles of Marketing (1976).

Marketing Summer Session in the '80s (1979).

Stress and Office Personnel, Faculty, Budget, and Campus Identity (1981).

Computers as Colleagues in an Academic Setting: The Emerging Challenge; Interviewing Your New Colleague; Introducing Your New Colleague to Your Staff; Working With Your New Colleague (1983).

Finance

The University in a Declining Resource Environment (1982).

Declining Federal Resources (1982).

Declining State and Provincial Resources (1982).

Declining Local Resources (1982).

Administration

Leadership/Role of the Summer Session Director in the Pursuit of Excellence (1984).

Tools and Techniques for Summer Administrators: Views and Tools You Can Use; Negotiating Skills (1985).

Problems and Solutions in Summer Term Administration (1986).

Negotiation Techniques in Summer Term Administration (1986).

Miscellaneous

Summary of Simulation Workshop (1971).

Jaws II (1980).

Role of Community College vs. Four-Year College (1985).

Program emphasis during the early 1970s on the role of summer sessions in relation to other parts of the environment and clientele serviced seems to have given way in later years to emphasis on operational problems and the improvement of summer session administration. Annual conference attendance between 1970 and 1986 ranged from a low of 36 in Fairbanks, Alaska in 1980 to a high of 72 in 1976 at Honolulu. Membership ranged from a low of 59 in 1970 to a high of 95 during the three consecutive years of 1976-1978.[27]

North Central Conference on Summer Schools[28]

Birth of NCCSS

Over the years, summer term deans and directors attending the annual meetings of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools found little in the meetings which helped them in their jobs as summer school administrators. This situation precipitated discussion among these administrators leading to the suggestion that a new organization be formed which would focus specifically on the problems of summer schools.

In March 1949, an informal meeting was held in Chicago of summer session administrators from institutions offering undergraduate and graduate degree programs. They met after the first General Session of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools to discuss the idea of providing a discussion forum for deans, directors, and other administrators responsible for summer sessions. Enock Dryness of Wheaton College presided as temporary chair for the meeting at which 45 persons were in attendance. Plans were laid for a first annual meeting by the selection of an eight-member Executive Committee to plan the first meeting held in March 1950. The organization was known as the Summer School Directors Conference. Fifty participants attended the first annual meeting at which officers and an executive committee were elected, with Enock Dryness chairman. Participants discussed common problems at the second annual meeting in 1951. An institutional membership fee was established, appropriate letterheads developed, and standing committees appointed. The Reverend M. B. Martin S.J. from St. Louis University became the second chairperson. The only category for membership is an institutional one, and annual dues are required of members. After the first year, Harold Ried of New Mexico University was elected as Secretary and continued for many years as the "prime mover" in the North Central Conference on Summer Schools.

Nature of the Organization

Although the organization was created by representatives from institutions active in the work of the regional accrediting agency, and typically meets at the same time and place, it is not an accrediting body. However, members have been interested in and dedicated to maintaining standards in summer sessions equal to those maintained at anytime throughout the academic year. Colleges and universities lying within or convenient to the nineteen state North Central area may apply for membership. From the beginning in 1950, there have been formally elected officers, appointed standing committees, and ad hoc committees appointed as needed. Major stated purposes of the conference are (1) to assemble at the time of the annual meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, administrators responsible for Summer School programs of interested colleges and university, (2) to provide opportunity for a review of pertinent phases of summer school operation, especially those of current nature, and (3) to hear reports of special committees previously assigned to make investigations. Additionally, the organization has sought to achieve other goals and objectives related to service and an appropriate exchange of information. Meetings typically begin on the evening of one day and extend through the following day, usually the week-end prior to the accrediting association annual meeting. In 1955, the name of the organization was changed to the North Central Conference on Summer Schools.

Programs consisting of both formal and informal presentations as well as open but directed discussions are prepared and announced well in advance. From an annual autumn survey of members, topics and problems of greatest interest are selected for the program. Sometimes topics selected a year in advance are assigned to ad hoc committees for study, research, and scheduled reports at the next annual meeting. Other topics on subjects emanate from the floor of the meeting and are discussed. Such exchanges offer a valuable opportunity for members to learn from other's experience what actions have succeeded or proved to be ineffective and why.

The conference is thoroughly democratic in concept and operation, and any institution providing undergraduate and/or graduate instruction during the summer and located in the region or convenient to it may apply for membership, either by written application or personal submission of an application at the time of the annual meeting. Member institutions have come from a wide geographical area extending from the Canadian to the Mexican borders and from the Pennsylvania line through the Rocky Mountain area. The structure and techniques of a conference are used to provide an open and free exchange of information and services of interest and value to the membership. Although programs are planned and scheduled, discussion and the privilege of raising questions on pertinent topics is unrestrained. Generous opportunity is afforded for informal and unscheduled exchanges of ideas and information. An important feature at the annual meeting has been the extensive displays of a wide variety of materials developed by member institutions.

Major Activities

In the first decade of existence, members of the conference moved from discussing only problems and concerns to the conduct of a major comprehensive study of faulty, salaries, credits and summer-term length. An attempt was also made to ascertain needs of students, and responses to the needs posed problems for discussion. Organizational concerns focused on methods and techniques of program organization, publicity, faculty, salaries, credit, admission and registration, and routine matters of running summer sessions.

Enrollment growth and interest exhibited by the Federal Government affected summer sessions during the 1960s decade. Institutions sought to improve their effectiveness and usefulness, and suggestions were made for continuing ways of making improvements by use of available resources. The impact of change and potency of the summer session were persistently of concern and interest. Concern over the image of the summer school director was apparent. In 1968, the need for a policy statement was discussed by members. Data enabling comparisons of information about faculty, students, and administration, while at first reported for only one year, were later reported on a two previous year basis.

In the 1970s, a major concern of the organization was the improvement of summer session quality through more effective planning, through cooperation with other divisions of the institution, through professional development of summer session directors, and through providing educational programs sought by the particular students served. The organization expanded its mode of operation by seeking to work with other summer school organizations. Collected data were used to project norms and to enhance the identification of continuing and emerging trends. Discussions at the annual meetings dealt with planning, costs/expenditures, effectiveness, and evaluation. Meeting programs reflected a change from concentrating on problems peculiar to institutional size to concern with the general overall patterns of organizing summer sessions.

During the first thirty years of existence, membership fluctuated from 51 to 141 institutions, and attendance at annual meetings varied from 31 to 98 participants. A perceived strength of the organization has been the wide range in size and type of institutions represented. Interest in certain types and issues persisted throughout the first three decades. Major threads of continuing interest were:

1. Organization and administration of summer sessions and its relationship to the total institution.
2. Summer school curricula.
3. Credit for workshops, institutes, conferences, and travel.
4. Standards for credit and length of sessions.
5. Policies for summer school staffing.

6. Salaries for summer school faculty (rate of compensation).
7. Budget considerations (degree of self-support).
8. Admissions policies.
9. Enrollments and characteristics of summer school students.
10. Summer session calendars and schedules.
11. Publication methods and techniques.

In addition to these themes of continuing and pervading interest, an examination of conference annual programs reveals that various other topics raised at one or two meetings never to surface again reflected an image of the general conditions and problems facing higher education, particularly in the North Central region.

North American Association of Summer Sessions[29]

During the winter of 1963-64, Clodus R. Smith of the University of Maryland--College Park and a few of his summer session colleagues came to the conclusion that an unmet need existed for a national summer sessions association. At that point in time, three different summer associations were active, but each had either philosophical or geographical parameters to their membership: (1) the Association of Summer Session Deans and Directors -- now the Association of University Summer Sessions (AUSS) -- limited its membership to certain identifiable universities, not to exceed 40 in number; (2) the North central Conference on Summer Schools (NCCSS) limited its membership to those institutions located in the North Central accrediting region; and (3) the Western Association of Deans and Directors of Summer Sessions--now the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators (WASSA) -- limited its membership to four-year institutions from the western reaches of the United States and Canada.

A decision was made by Smith and his colleagues to identify a representative sample of colleges and universities from across the nation and invite summer administrators to attend a planning meeting for the consideration of creating a "national" association. The main purpose of the organization would be the development of summer sessions standards and programs. Care was taken to include different types of institutions representing all sections of the country. Subsequently, a "Dear Colleague" letter was sent to 45 selected colleges and universities inviting them to send a representative to an organizational meeting in Washington, D.C., April 26-27, 1964. To the delight of the sponsors, 28 people chose to attend. After substantive deliberation and discussion, the decision was made to organize. Over that two-day period in April, work sessions produced a constitution, bylaws, and the first slate of officers for the new organization, known as the National Association of College and University Summer Sessions. NACUSS was born.

The first National Summer Sessions Conference was held November 4-6, 1964 in Denver, Colorado. It was co-sponsored by NACUSS and the Western Association of Deans and Directors of Summer Sessions, and 115 participants attended. As a result of a vigorous recruitment effort, 179 colleges and universities had elected to become members of the fledgling association by year's end. NACUSS was organized into six geographic regions, each one having its own vice president. The governing body was--and still is--the Administrative Council, then consisting of the President, President-Elect, Past President, treasurer, and each of the six Regional Vice Presidents.

Over the last 23 years, the association has grown and matured, changing its name twice. In 1968, it became the National Association of Summer Sessions (NASS), and in 1975, in deference to the Canadian and Mexican members, the name was changed to the North American Association of Summer Sessions (NAASS). The association now has 434 institutional members, located in 49 states, the District of Columbia, eight Canadian provinces, and one state of Mexico.

American Summer Sessions Senate

Beginnings

In 1972, Clay Schoenfeld communicated with officials of the four summer sessions organizations described above to identify individuals who had been president of the organization that were still actively engaged as summer session deans or directors.[30] Then he sought reaction from past presidents to the idea of forming an informal organization limited in membership to past presidents who were still active. There was a 100% enthusiastic affirmative response from 15 persons identified. Several comments reflect the enthusiasm for a means by which there could be a broad ranging forum for the discussion of summer sessions issues and matters of general concern. They were: "a terrific idea," "an excellent idea," "a very useful device," "possibilities for some significant contributions," and "a very fine idea worthy of exploration and experimentation."[31] Another major role for the Senate was to provide a communications and dialogue bridge between the four other Summer Sessions organizations, hopefully resulting in unified stands on a number of crucial issues and topics of national scope.

Other roles were:

1. To gather together or develop guidelines and criteria for the evaluation of effective Summer Session administration. The intent of this role is to provide a yardstick upon which the Summer Session administrator may evaluate his or her program and administration.
2. To identify central and critical areas within the area of Summer Sessions for research. In accomplishing such an end, the Senate could provide for mustering and coordination of resources.
3. To facilitate the continued programming and development of the New Summer Session Directors Institute. Attention should also be directed toward the possibility of an advanced institute or workshop for experienced Summer Session Administrators who wish to improve their effectiveness as administrators.
4. To initiate and facilitate a link or liaison with appropriate and influential persons and agencies in our Federal Government. The goal should be to further strengthen the interests of the Federal Government in Summer Sessions and provide a voice for Summer Sessions within the broader realm of Higher Education. It is foreseen that a person working in the Washington, D.C. area would be necessary to facilitate such interests.

In 1974, a National Institute for Summer Term administration to serve the needs of persons new to summer session administration was organized by the Senate and promoted through the four associations. It was held with success, and a second institute, with financial assistance from NAASS was held in Tempe, Arizona in January 1975 with Arizona State University hosting in collaboration with the University of Wisconsin--Madison. The Institute meeting was again promoted through the associations to all summer sessions association members and to all accredited institutions of higher education in the United States. At the second Institute, a participant ceiling of 50 had been established, and 49 actually enrolled. Both public and private and large and small institutions were represented from a broad geographical area from Maine to California. About 8 of every 10 of the participants had been in summer session administration two and one-half years or less, and one-fourth were women. As with the first Institute, participants felt the experience was serving their needs and recommended a continuation of the Institute. Co-directors of the second Institute, Denis Kigin and Nancy Abraham felt the Institute had been a success for persons new to summer administration and recommended the third Institute be held in 1977.[32]

Besides sponsoring the Institutes, the Senate members were interested in having some type of representative or spokesman in Washington, D.C. The purpose would be to have someone there who could speak for the interests of Summer Schools or who could keep the Summer Sessions Associations membership informed of pending legislation pertinent to their interest. The perceived problem was that there had been no special funding or support for Summer Sessions per se by any federal groups. Cited as evidence were that no recognition had been given to summer studies in Congressional discussions of higher education and that Summer Sessions had never been included in studies conducted by some of the research-oriented professional organizations. The purpose for contact with various Washington-based federal government bodies and professional research-oriented higher education organizations was discussed.[33]

The ASSS Grows

During 1975, the organization sought to be represented among the organizations invited to attend special conference sessions of the American Association for Higher Education to be held in March 1976.[34] A brochure entitled, "The American Summer Sessions Senate" prepared for 1975-76 announced the primary organizational purpose as providing a coordinated voice for summer session leadership on the higher education front. Work of the Senate was to be carried out with members working collectively, individually, and by working with and through the four parent associations. Although there was an Executive Committee, there was no constitution, no dues, and no formal annual meeting. By that time three categories of membership had evolved, namely, active, associate, and emeritus. The first included association past presidents active in summer session administration, and the second included past presidents in other forms of university endeavor. The latter included retired past association presidents. Membership consisted of 22 active, 10 associate, and 7 emeritus members.

Specific purposes had been developed. They were to:

1. Help state the case for vigorous summer session development to appropriate educational agencies and organizations.
2. Provide a means of continuing communication among the four principal summer session associations.
3. Stimulate research toward improved summer session functions, policies, and practices.
4. Facilitate exchange of information and insight among its members.
5. Help delineate new dimensions in summer session standards and opportunities.
6. Respond to special tasks as the needs of higher education require; for example, sponsor a periodic institute for new summer term administrators.

It was agreed at an annual meeting at Carefree, Arizona in November 1975 with twelve members present to offer the National Institute in Summer Term Administration for new deans and directors on alternate years instead of every year as had been the case in 1974 and 1975. Arrangements were made to explore affiliation with the American Council on Education in the name of the National Association of Summer Sessions (NASS) acting as agent for all Summer Session associations. The four associations were urged to move cooperatively with dispatch to define demographic terms, perfect a consolidated data retrieval instrument, and develop as meaningful as possible annual reports and trend analyses. A position paper on Summer Session Standards was prepared for the North Central Conference on Summer Schools. To improve exchange of information among the four associations, a semi-annual Senate newsletter was agreed upon. The Senate agreed to begin meetings twice a year at the times when the North Central Conference on Summer Schools met in the spring and the National Association of Summer Sessions met in the ensuing fall.[35]

By late Spring 1976, plans were underway for the Third National Institute on Summer Term Administration, and the North American Association of Summer Sessions had taken out membership on behalf of all associations with the American Council on Education. Membership was viewed as a way to open up the concept of a "man in Washington" for summer term affairs. All four summer session associations were reported moving cooperatively to define demographic terms, perfect a consolidated data retrieval instrument, and develop meaningful reports and trend analyses. The effort was believed to be urgent due to the imminent re-entry of the U.S. Office of Education in the summer term statistics picture.[36]

At a meeting on October 18, 1976 in the Harvard Faculty Club, the agenda consisted of attention to the 1977 National Institute (for new summer session administrators), Washington, D.C. representation, Senate organizational roles, coordinated data, nominations and NAASS meeting. At this meeting, a decision was made to extend membership to current presidents of the four Summer Session associations.

At the November 1977 meeting in San Antonio, twelve members were present. Considerable spirited discussion ensued after it was reported that negative attitudes had been detected among some of the Washington-based funding agencies about the effectiveness of short courses, including those of full summer length. After discussing the merits of salary data published by the National Association of Summer Sessions in the Joint Statistical Report, the membership present voted to convey to the NASS Research Committee the following, "The Senate along with many individual institutions is seriously concerned about the publication of salary data, given their uncertainty, and urged the Research Committee to take the matter under advisement."[37] Whether the institute for new summer session administrators would be continued beyond 1977 was discussed as was the status of efforts to have a "man in Washington." Neither of the co-directors wished to continue with a 1979 Institute, so the American Summer Session Senate conveyed through its chairperson Marion Marts to them the following message, "You and your institutions, are fully entitled to rest on your laurels. You have made a contribution pro bono publico that is an order of magnitude beyond what most of us do."[38]

The Executive Committee of ASSS met during the spring of 1978 at the University of Southern California. Discussion items included summer sessions representation in Washington, consolidated annual retrieval report, joint or coordinated meetings of national associations, institute for new summer sessions directors, and shared programs with graduate school deans and registrars. Also discussed was a bibliography of summer sessions research literature, communications among association offices, and public relations articles in appropriate journals.[39] Willard Thompson, University of Minnesota succeeded Marion Marts as chairperson of ASSS. A relatively short time later, the organization ceased to exist.

CADESS

The Canadian Association of Departments of Extension and Summer Schools (CADESS) was formed in 1954 to serve the interests of those involved in university extension and summer school activity. The organization is an associated organization of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), and membership consists of those institutions in good standing with the latter, interested in extension and summer school activities, and desire to join.

In 1962 a trust fund was created from contributions made by Extension Departments and Divisions of member universities to assist adult educators outside Canada who wish to travel in Canada to study University Extension programs and to assist Canadian adult educators abroad to extend their knowledge through travel study. On-going activities included the publication of a directory of summer school credit courses. During the 1967-68 year, forty-one institutions belonged, and in 1968-69, thirty-nine belonged.[40]

Objectives are that the Association shall:

1. Be concerned with the University's responsibility in credit and non-credit extension programs.
2. Provide a national and regional forum for the discussion of matters relating to university extension.
3. Represent the university extension in Canada and internationally.
4. Encourage the maintenance and development of diploma and degree programs in extension and adult education in Canadian universities and colleges.

5. Promote in-service and graduate training of existing and potential university extension staff.
6. Encourage and conduct studies related to university extension activities.
7. Maintain active liaison with other groups and associations in Canada and elsewhere which are concerned with adult education.

Summary

Like numerous other professionals performing specialized collegiate services, administrators of summer sessions/terms have sought the mutual advantages of sharing ideas and problems with colleagues in other collegiate institutions. In addition to informal telephone and written communications, administrators of several of the largest universities sought to foster this exchange through the creation of a limited membership formal organization for the purpose. As time passed regionally-based formal organizations sprung up with greatly expanded memberships. In the 1960s the North American Association of Summer Sessions with membership of national and international scope began functioning. Some collegiate institutions maintain membership in both the regionally and internationally based professional associations. An attempt to form an American Summer Sessions Senate composed of past but still active presidents of the several associations waxed for a few years then waned out of existence.

Conspicious by their absence are memberships in any of the associations extant of two-year colleges, particularly the public ones. A number of the two-year colleges are larger in enrollment size than most four-year institutions, and they provide about the same ratio (summer to previous fall) of summer service to students. Only the future will determine if two-year colleges will form their own association or be invited to participate in one or more of the existing organizations.

Chapter 9 -- Endnotes

1. Letter from Edward H. Kraus to S. H. Goodnight and George P. Bristol dated 28 September 1917, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

2. Ibid., 1.

3. Letter from S. H. Goodnight to Edward H. Kraus dated 3 October 1917, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

4. Letter from Edward H. Kraus to George P. Bristol dated 11 October 1917, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

5. Letter from Edward H. Kraus, Director of Summer Sessions to President H. B. Hutchins, University of Michigan dated 11 October 1917, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

6. Circular letter from Goodnight, Bristol and Kraus dated 12 October 1917, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

7. Letter from Kraus, Bristol and Goodnight to President Harry Pratt Judson dated 26 October 1917, and letter from Edward H. Kraus to Rollin D. Salisbury dated 19 November 1917, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

8. Letter from Edward H. Kraus to S. H. Goodnight dated 29 October 1917, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

9. Undated report of the meeting and Michigan Daily news releases dated 21 and 22 November 1917, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917,University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

10. Michigan Daily news release dated 25 November 1917, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

11. Letter from Edward H. Kraus to J. L. McConaughy dated 30 November 1917, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

12. Association of Deans and Directors of Summer Sessions, Proceedings: Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Association of Deans and Directors of Summer Sessions, (N.P.: The Association, 1940), 6 as reported in Russell A. May, "A History of the Association of University Summer Sessions" (Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1971), 32.

13. Ibid.

14. Letter from Edward H. Kraus and J. E. Lough to F. J. Kelly dated 30 October 1919, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1919, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

15. Historical material from this point has been adapted from Russell A. May, "A History of the Association of University Summer Sessions" (Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1971), 34-65.

16. Association of Deans and Directors of Summer Sessions, "Minutes of the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Association of Deans and Directors of Summer Sessions," 1933, 52 as reported in Russell A. May, "A History of the Association of University Summer Sessions: Fifty Years of Progress" (Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1971), 41-42.

17. U.S. Office of Education, *Summer Sessions in Colleges and Universities of the United States*, by Donald F. Warner, et al., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Circular No. 700 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961).

18. John R. Little, address to the North Central Conference of Summer Schools, Chicago, Illinois, March 1963.

19. Clarence A. Schoenfeld and Neil Schmitz, *Year-Round Education: Its Problems and Prospects from Kindergarten to College* (Madison: Dembor Educational Research Services, Inc., 1964).

20. Material adapted from John R. Little, "The Development of the Western Association of Summer School Administrators" (unpublished mimeographed paper prepared in 1965 and revised January 1966), Boulder, Colorado: Office of Summer Sessions, University of Colorado.

21. Letter from Jil Warn to William P. McDougall, 15 February 1987.

22. Western Association of Summer Session Administrators, "Business Meeting Minutes of the 1966 Annual Conference, Western Association of Summer Session Administrators, Portland, Oregon, 4 November 1966." Office of Summer Sessions, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.

23. Ellvert H. Himes, *WASSA: A History*, Lone copy provided to the authors by Denis Kigin, Director of Summer Sessions, Arizona State University (Logan, Utah: Office of Summer Sessions, Utah State University, 1973).

24. Ibid., 12.

25. Ibid., 15.

26. Jill Warn, "Review of General Session Topics Since 1970 for Annual Conferences of WASSA" (Unpublished Paper Prepared for a Western Association of Summer Session Administrators' Conference). Office of Summer Sessions, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.

27. Letter from Jil Warn to William P. McDougall, 15 February 1987.

28. Alan T. Seagren and Ruth E. Randall, Thirty Years of Sharing, Summer Sessions Commitment to Students, Innovations and Quality (Rockford, Illinois: North Central Conference on Summer Schools, 1979), ERIC, ED 181 813; and J. Howard Kramer, "Facts and Functions: A Brief History of the North Central Conference on Summer Schools" (mimeographed), *Office of Summer Sessions, South Dakota State University, Aberdeen,* South Dakota, 1962.

29. Letter from Mike Nelson, Secretary-Treasurer, North American Association of Summer Sessions to Raymond J. Young dated 12 December 1986.

30. Letters from Clay Schoenfeld to Robert Richey, Charles Noyes, Denis Kigin, and Curt Moore, 6 December 1972.

31. Clarence A. Schoenfeld, "Summary of Responses" (Typed and Undated Results of a Survey of Past Presidents of Summer Session Associations), Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

32. "Review of Second National Institute in Summer Term Administration, Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State University, 5-8 January 1975" (undated and mimeographed), Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

33. Notes for Meeting of American Summer Session Senate on "Our Man in Washington," (mimeographed), 11 November 1975, Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

34. Letter from Clarence A. Schoenfeld to American Association for Higher Education, 21 November 1975, Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

35. Memo from Clarence A. Schoenfeld to Senate members on "Record of Meeting, Tuesday 11 November, Carefree, Arizona," 13 November 1975, Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

36. Memo from Clarence A. Schoenfeld to Senate members on "Committee Reports," 17 May 1976, Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

37. Marion Marts, "Minutes of the 1977 Annual Meeting," 14 November 1977, Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

38. Letter from Marion Marts to Denis Kigin and Nancy Abraham, 14 November 1977, Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

39. Letter from Clarence A. Schoenfeld to Paul Hadley, 29 December 1977 and Agenda for American Summer Sessions Senate Executive Committee Meeting, 23-24 March 1978, Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

40. Canadian Association of Departments of Extension and Summer Schools, Directory of Personnel, Ottawa: The Association, 1968 ERIC, ED 016 923 and 026 575 and 1969 ERIC, 035 808.

CHAPTER 10

SUMMER SESSION PROBLEMS, ISSUES, AND TRENDS

Introduction

Research has identified problems experienced by administrators regarding collegiate summer session planning and execution.[1] In addition to issues and trends manifest from data gathered from summer session administrators during studies, a selected group of 26 experienced, nationally active and professionally well known summer session administrators were asked what they believed were the most important issues and trends as the 1980s decade terminated. Contents of this chapter relate to these matters. While practitioners apparently find difficulty in projecting or forecasting future conditions and directions of change, an attempt to cite possible alternatives has been made through the development of important questions, the answers to which will only come with time.

Problems

Problems cited by summer term administrators undoubtedly reflect some problems experienced generally by higher educational institutions. A 1982 study revealed that differences by institutional type existed among the problems cited.[2] A hunch that types of problems administrators experienced might be related to their prior patterns of professional work backgrounds was unfounded. Administrators, regardless of work background, cited the same types of problems.

Summer term administrators in research, doctoral granting, and comprehensive collegiate institutions selected from a listing of problems those they considered to be of first, second, and third rank in importance. The four problems cited most frequently for each rank were determined. Securing adequate funds for summer programming and developing a basis for setting faculty salaries were among the top four cited as first, second, and third rank in importance. The implementation of innovative and experimental programs was one of the four most frequently cited as both first and third rank in importance, while determining the effectiveness of marketing methods was among the four most frequently cited as both second and third rank in importance. The problem of developing an image that summer session contributes to the institutional goals and mission was among the four problems ranked first in importance. Budget development and administration was another of the most frequently cited problems as second rank in importance.[3]

In research universities, implementing innovative and experimental programs was the problem cited most frequently, but in both doctoral granting and comprehensive universities, the predominant problem was securing adequate funds for summer programming. Problems cited next most frequently by research university administrators were accommodating enrollment increases, securing adequate funds, budget development and administration, and determining a basis for summer faculty salaries. Although the latter two problems were cited also by administrators of doctoral granting and comprehensive institutions, they were concerned additionally about determining the effectiveness of marketing methods and implementing innovative and experimental programs. No administrators in research universities cited summer session image as a problem, but this was considered a problem by about 3 of every 10 administrators in doctoral granting universities and by approximately 2 of every 10 in comprehensive institutions.

The problems identified seem to fall into the categories of finance/ funding, philosophical mooring, and purpose. The money concerns and the perceived problem regarding the image that summer programs indeed contribute to overall institutional goals and mission seem inextricably interwoven and most predominant in doctoral granting and comprehensive institutions. The purpose of providing opportunity for creative or innovative program development and experimentation, while a matter of concern in some doctoral granting and comprehensive institutions, was of most concern in research institutions.

Other problems less frequently identified in doctoral granting and comprehensive institutions were (1) developing standards for workshops, institutes, travel tours, and extension classes, (2) meeting student demands for enrollment and recreational activities, (3) allocation of credit for short-term and non-traditional activities, and (4) faculty performance evaluation. Problems cited by only research university administrators were programming for short-term summer activities and accommodating enrollment increases. Other less frequently cited problems by administrators in research, doctoral-granting and comprehensive institutions were (1) getting highly qualified staff to teach summer session courses, (2) communicating with administrators and faculty regarding the functions and importance of summer session, and (3) evaluation of summer session program activities.

Based on a 95.2 percent response from a one-third random sample of 83 technical colleges and 671 public two-year colleges with head count enrollments of 1,500 or more, predominant problems related to summer sessions were identified.[4] The problems cited in order of frequency were (1) generated revenues short of demand, (2) problems relevant to curriculum and services development, especially the need for program expansion and quality control, (3) staffing, and (4) inadequate enrollments for curricular breadth and need to increase enrollments. Other less frequently mentioned problems were scheduling, selection of offerings to schedule, administrative matters, facilities, and public relations/marketing.

Issues

A common understanding of the term "issue" is that it denotes a point of discussion, debate, or dispute; a matter about which there is a variance of opinion, controversy, and even disagreement. This is the connotation intended by use of the term in this section.

Historically, collegiate summer school activities seem to have attached themselves like academic aphids to their hosts, some of which have welcomed and incorporated them as an integral component of the institution. This incorporation of higher education programs and activities is consonant with emerging demographic, social, and economic changes to achieve institutional goals and to carry out the institutional mission. Some hosts have condescended to tolerate summer sessions if they seemed to serve socially useful and beneficial purposes such as licensure and remediation without much drain on resources. One category of these hosts seem reluctant to acknowledge the need for a changed conception of higher education in a society no longer dominated by the conditions, mores, traditions, and needs of either an agrarian or an industrial society. The second category consists of hosts willing to permit and exploit the existence of summer sessions for revenue generating, faculty employment and retention, and other term admissions enhancement purposes so long as there was no interference with other term operations. Some hosts have proscribed them altogether.

A few institutions that have not incorporated summer session as an integral component use summer sessions to their advantage in a planned manner.

Melvin Bernstein, summer administrator at the University of Maryland--College Park stated that summer session issues, trends, and projections are all interrelated at this time. He explained his rationale as follows:

> As we approach the last decade of the century, most institutions face demographic projections which indicate a downturn in enrollments. Then, fairly early in the next century the results of a new baby boom will be realized with a new upturn in enrollments. The problem will be interim survival; not simply basic programs, which in most instances seem to be well entrenched, but the broad developments which have given many summer campuses the full aura of winter programs. These are no longer frills, but the essentials of a full campus environment.
>
> As enrollments drop, the revenues that have made broad complimentary programs possible will begin to dry up. There will be temptations to cut corners in order to maintain these programs as well as broad academic offerings which may not be in demand. Self-support units especially must begin to play carefully for a decade of

contingencies and not take short term solutions which may compromise the integrity of programs and contribute to the demoralization of the faculty.

Issue of Institutionalization/Philosophical Mooring

Except for providing some faculty summer employment, generating additional monies for the institutional general budget, and utilizing some facilities more fully throughout the year, none of which relate to educational service to students or other educational purposes, one could wonder why summer sessions are even offered, especially in state supported universities. If the students served during summer are not considered as important by the institutional administrations and legislators as those attending during other terms, at issue is the question of why bother to have summer sessions? If the institution is serious in achieving its objectives to accomplish its mission, the troublesome paradox is why graduate and other term undergraduate students seeking to accelerate, continue, or to complete academic programs should not be guaranteed the same thesis advisement services and quality of program offerings as are other term students. In this regard Leslie J. Coyne, Director of Summer Sessions, Indiana University, reported he thought an issuewas the role of the summer session as a meaningful participant in an institution's mission in delivering higher education to its constituencies. He said:

> Some of us are working very hard to education and strengthen the role and perception of Summer Sessions as a substantial key player in the business of higher education within our institutions. However, I seem to be seeing more and more Summer Sessions operations being diminished, in terms of staffing status, program size, and position within the structure of the institutions.

Jack Mauch, Idaho State University, indicated from his point of view, which is generally one of integrating summer sessions into the host institution, the mission of summer programming should be compatible and in step with the mission of the college or university. He said:

> That may take many forms, but in general there should be a clear idea of how the mission of one fits into the mission of the other. Some administrators may feel that Summer Sessions should be apart from, and not a part of, the host institution. That would be fine, but I still believe a clear picture of the relationship should be spelled out so that all concerned will know and understand the relationship. I feel too many (including mine) do not have such a delineation of relationships; we are seeking to create such a picture with the new advisory council we have recently formed on campus to do that.

"The perceived place (i.e., role, importance) of summer sessions will be an issue within institutions, particularly as competition for scarce resources increases," predicted Lloyd Carswell, University of Alberta. The tenuousness of summer sessions in host institutions that have not adopted a concept of institutionalized year around higher education compatible with modern world demands was expressed by Ken Griffin, University of Wyoming. He pointed out that:

> University administrators at the highest levels enjoy brief tenure (4-7 years) today. The nature of administrative career tracks typically necessitate well developed personal agendas for those "on the move." Summer session programs, especially those which are not self-funded, are more vulnerable to administrative dictated change (i.e., mission, budgets, audiences, etc.) which reflect these personal agendas and goals than are academic programs which are better institutionalized than summer programs.

Issues Related to Funding/Budgeting

Issues pertinent to summer sessions which reflect most poignantly those affecting higher education in general relate to funding and financing. The influence of enrollment management practices was cited as an issue by Thomas S. McLeRoy, University of Wisconsin--Whitewater. He said:

> Enrollment management around the country has had an effect upon the summer session whether or not the enrollment management has been applied to the summer session per se. With budget being a problem in both private and public institutions, a proactive position for funding the summer session needs to be developed by those who know summer session--the summer session administrators. The reason for enrollment management in a public institution is primarily budget. Some university chief administrators see the summer session money as a source for enhancing a rather soft budget during the year. However, the issue needs to be treated with collective wisdom. The operation, guaranteed contracts and small classes, funding of the summer operation based upon better cost analysis, established university priorities and sound business principles used by a qualified summer session administrator are essential issues that need to be addressed.

The increased demand for higher stipends from senior instructional staff as their full-time salaries increase was identified as an issue by Lloyd Carswell, University of Alberta along with, "a move towards requiring Summer Sessions to be cost recovery or profit making operations." This view was seconded by Lee W. Kneerim, Connecticut College, who cited as an issue, "Summer Sessions as 'too successful' as income generators--threat of take-over of institutions in need of income as costs increase." She also indicated at issue was how to manage a shrinkage of student (summer) enrollments where in the Northeast the 18 and over age population is shrinking faster than elsewhere. Donald G. Tarbet, University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill stated:

> Single biggest issue deals with finances, faculty are paid a percentage of nine-month contract (1/2 for teaching a 3 credit hour course) with currently no "cap," and salaries are becoming huge. Our system limits the flexibility of each campus to set its own tuition rates. Therefore, tuition rates have not gone up enough/often enough to keep up with faculty salary increases. This forces us to teach larger and larger classes and to offer only those that we know will "go."

Lee W. Kneerim, Connecticut College believed an issue was, "cost accounting for summer sessions (or continuing education) in institutions that do not practice cost accounting."

Issues Regarding Organization

There are continuing issues concerning the placement of responsibility for summer session administration and the mode of operation for planning within the institutions. These issues were pointed up by Leslie J. Coyne, Indiana University as follows:

> I think the issue of decentralization is and will continue to be a major concern for the business, not only that it is happening, but why is it happening? Is this occurring as a function of a building trend towards cost-centered budgeting, unit accountability, perception of lack of importance, or what?
>
> Another important issue relates to Summer Sessions and Continuing Education. I have been concerned over the years with the rise in combining Continuing Education and Summer Sessions. My sense is that this occurs more as a function of individual decision-making or personality strength than it does from rational institutional examination. I sense that Continuing Education is not faring as well as people would have projected it would fare at this point in time in higher education. It seems we are still very much clinging to traditional notions of who we are and who we are serving, and, in spite of the demographics, we are going to be hard pressed to change that, at least in the larger institutions with which I am familiar. To me, Summer Sessions relate to the interest of the more traditional notion of what higher education is about and, therefore, having been attached to Continuing Education may not fare as well as it could.

Another summer session director indicated a prime issue was the battle of the budget--money makers (such as) business/engineering will want to get out of the centralized summer programs and run their own shows. Ken Griffin, University of Wyoming, indicated that:

> Campus-based Summer Session programs will be impacted increasingly by the desire of students to be served off-campus, thus precluding relocation to campuses even for a brief period of time. This creates opportunities for off-campus, extension programs as well as for "degree mills," which are positioned to offer expensive off-campus programs of dubious academic quality.

Larry Cobb, San Diego State University, thought the big issue may relate to whether, ". . . our system goes to year-round operation for budget purposes."

Issues Relating to Program

Major issues regarding curriculum were pointed up by Nancy Abraham, University of Wisconsin--Madison, when she raised a couple of questions after stating, "From my perspective one of the main issues continues to be that of serving in the best ways possible a diversity of populations ranging from pre-college youth to seniors." She asked, "How do we balance all of the many needs for both credit and non-credit opportunities over against the limited resources?" Further she asked, "How do we maintain quality within diversity as costs rise and budgets are held fairly steady?" In the same vein Gary Penders, University of California at Los Angeles, indicated an issue was responding to 'education equity' in a self-support environment--the economics of providing for disadvantaged minorities." He cited as an issue the "internal restrictions of the campus environment, and its companion, administrative (both ours and theirs) desire to serve all possible constituencies." He also cited the "continuing battle of 'stealing' regular FTE with a large comprehensive summer academic program."

The availability of faculty was cited as an issue by Harold P. Sampson, Central Missouri State University. He referred to the quality of courses/programs offered during the summer session to international students in their native countries:the length of short courses--hours of credit granted. The standard of one hour credit in one week is meeting new threats.

That summer session is tending to be more like the other terms and a threat to innovation and experimentation was an issue voiced by Dick Moe, Pacific Lutheran University. He said, "I perceive a trend toward making the summer session more like a regular academic year term. I see this as a threat to the innovative and experimental nature of Summer Sessions." He stated further that, "I believe Summer Session deans and directors will need to develop research data to validate short Summer Session courses as being legitimate academic experiences." That summer session planning should be more proactive with the continuing education needs of other professionals and other paraprofessionals, disregarding the school teacher, was a concern expressed by Karen Simpkins, Idaho State University. She advised, "Integrate the summer session teacher into the curriculum planning--to compliment not to compete with fall, and spring sessions--in other words long-term planning on curriculum at the teacher, chair level, to the dean--not only at the dean level."

One director cited competition as an issue. Other advertising will reduce effectiveness of college efforts, making marketing essential but not very satisfying.

Trends and Projections

What does the future hold? What can the nation expect of summer sessions in collegiate institutions in the future? What are the significant trends that may impact the future? These are the kinds of questions a number of experienced summer session administrators considered in their attempt to forecast future prospects.

Students and Programs

Dick Moe, Pacific Lutheran University, predicts that, "summer session enrollments will continue to grow as students work at accelerating entry into the workplace." Another administrator indicated students are taking longer to graduate--will need summers, but good full time students are harder to find, and minorities will expect more access. Karen Simpkins, Idaho State University, predicts, "nights, weekends--more family related summer planning; mom go to school; dad pick up a weekend seminar; son in camp or computer camp; daughter in a science program, etc." She says, "Enhance the summer social and entertainment realm to encompass these markets. Use summer to recruit for state, city, campus, and most of all--the new student."

Jack Mauch, Idaho State University, referred to the changing face of summer session students. He said:

> It is difficult to ascertain, lacking current information, how much the student body for Summer Sessions has changed. However, I have to believe that Summer Session students have changed in the same fashion as fall/spring students have. They are most likely older, probably more and more part-time students who work full time. In other words, the nontraditional (I prefer to call them "New Majority") students are at our door steps, and I wonder what we are doing to accommodate them. To illustrate via our local situation, ISU now is within literally 300 students of being 50-50 (half full-time and half part-time students) during the school year. That means approximately half of our students work days and attend class at night--during the fall and spring terms. Yet, as of this year, I cannot get the academic units on our campus to offer more than three or four night classes during the summer. We are therefore not serving virtually half of our student body during the summertime. How will Summer Sessions deal with this? How will ISU as an institution deal with this? What does the Summer Sessions Mission Statement say about this? Does the institution want to commit resources (we are state-appropriations supported) to serve the other half of its student body during the summer?

The expectation of a slow continued growth of summer enrollments was predicted by Lloyd Carswell, University of Alberta. He referred to the increasing demand from students (especially part time) for the year-round sequencing of courses. He believed that:

> Summer Sessions will be called upon to provide a core curriculum for students. The programming emphasis will be on what courses are required for programs, as opposed to those courses which will turn a profit. This trend will be in conflict with the increasing student demand and will require a readjustment of attitudes, especially in older tradition-bound institutions such as mine. We will have to become more innovative in our scheduling to accommodate the changing clientele.

More programs in the summer (i.e., short, credit or CEU or non-credit workshops replacing credit courses were foreseen by Lee W. Kneerim of Connecticut College. Jill Warn, University of California--San Diego, foresaw the following developments:

> (1) Intensive (residential) language/cultural education. (2) Knowledge students need in work and as community member requires that they attend summer programs to take special interest courses in order to graduate in 4 years. (3) In-residence summer study abroad programs where professor accompanies student. Topic: Internationalism.

Organization and Administration

Ken Griffin, University of Wyoming, predicted:

> There will be increasing interest by faculty in securing summer session teaching as a supplement to the academic year salary; at the same time, there are pressures to reduce summer stipends. At research institutions, particularly those with below average salary levels, there are the cross pressures as to what faculty should be devoting summers to research activities, not to instructional activities for supplemental pay.

The use of adjunct faculty to teach in summer and longer academic years thus minimizing the importance of summer term were foreseen as waves of the future by Harold P. Sampson of Central Missouri State University.

Concerning the role of summer session within a university, Thomas S. McLeRoy, University of Wisconsin--Whitewater, offered the following observations.

> Summer Session as an integral part of the university needs to concentrate on quality issues in that its format is shorter than the academic year. Quality initially can be addressed by developing a philosophy statement. Many institutions have already established as part of its mission a philosophy of summer session. As the faculty of summer session is but a fraction of the academic year, summer session planning needs to have faculty input at the grass roots level. Every summer session administrator needs to establish a viable "advisory" group of faculty, college administrators and students to serve as a sounding board of ideas and also a representative group to search out general faculty and student response to proposed changed.
>
> A second trend that has hit the scene in many places is innovative and creative programming from an all university setting. Faculty need to be provided an opportunity to develop innovative courses during the summer session. Unless monies are available in an all university setting away from departments and colleges, much innovation and creativity is stifled.

As Leslie J. Coyne, Indiana University, put it:

> It is going to be very interesting to see how Summer Sessions fare in terms of status

> within the institution. There is also the matter of the continuing trend toward decentralization, at least in the near future. Efforts will have to be undertaken to strengthen the visibility and posture of Summer Sessions nationally, regionally, and within the institution. It is going to take some significant efforts along that spectrum to forestall what I see as an increasing trend of diminishing importance or at least status. Again, this is all subjective, but it would certainly make for some interesting inquiries.

Looking to the future Nancy Abraham, University of Wisconsin--Madison, expressed her concerns for the future by raising three questions. They were:

1. Will what seems a trend to institutions viewing summer sessions as another term, impact on the ability of summer administrators to be creative and flexible in their offerings?
2. With more faculty reaching retirement age, will the summer sessions be negatively/positively impacted in terms of the kinds of credit offerings it can provide its students?
3. With a declining number of high school age students expected to enter colleges/universities in the 1990's to what extent will summer sessions programs, enrollments, and budgets be affected?

One summer session administrator indicated, whereas the summer session office now reports to both a Vice Chancellor for Extension and also to the Provost (Academic Affairs Vice Chancellor), he expected that extension services would be reorganized and the summer session office would report only to the Provost in a couple of years. Another summer session director, Gary Penders, UCLA, predicted that campus specialization would be determined by the strengths and kinds of competition faced by an institution and that there would be more centralized control followed by a resurgence of large central controlled comprehensive programs.

Presidents' Expectation of Summer Session

In preparation for a keynote address President Lloyd Watkins of Illinois State University collected opinions from ten public midwestern universities about what they expected of summer sessions.[5] While the group of respondents was small and geographically limited to the heartland, the results provide a glimmer of expectations not unlike those one would probably find throughout the land with possibly some regional variations.

Conclusions were that the summer session can be the most vital and interesting segment of the year if properly supported and organized. Presidents ought to have high expectations of summer sessions and value the importance of that work with administrators responsible having input into the key decision-making processes on each campus which impact summer programming. It has long been held that summer sessions are different, and such thinking is currently basically sound thinking. A summary of several specific beliefs held by presidents was as follows:

1. Summer session is an ideal time for testing innovations. While it is suspected that faculties are slow to change radically the programmatic and curricular structure of the other academic terms in response to lessons learned through summer time experimentation, summer sessions have functioned as a testing vehicle. The degree of flexibility which exists on most campuses during summer has often spawned new approaches regarding curriculum, teaching methods, course intensity, etc. which have challenged old concepts. Although it can be expected that some resistance will occur to innovations tested in the crucibles of summer session, that period of the academic year can be a major vehicle for innovation and for institutional improvement.

2. Presidents are beginning again to value the summer period as a time for strenthening relationships with elementary and secondary schools. A spate of evaluative reports questioning the quality of common school education and of teacher education programs have reminded summer session program planners that universities still have a major responsibility for helping teachers improve the nation's schools. The opportunity exists for tailor-made summer courses, programs, and activities (such as workshops) that more nearly meet teachers' needs than is typically done during other terms with traditional graduate courses. Several presidents concurred that this constituency has been neglected, and further neglect will be at the universities' peril.

3. Summer sessions should offer regular degree program students opportunities for accelerating their progress toward completion. While quicker completion may not be better for all students, those older than recent high school graduates have a legitimate case for opportunities to complete degree programs more quickly in order to get on with their lives.

4. Presidents expect summer sessions to offer to regular degree program students opportunities for taking courses difficult to schedule during other terms, for enrolling in courses time would not permit in a standard four-year curriculum, and courses for enrichment purposes.

5. That the summer session can help institutions be more cost effective by more fully utilizing campus facilities (residence halls, dining halls, student centers, etc.) was an expectation of presidents. Summer utilization of facilities may reduce some of the heavy usage during other terms with a consequence of better institutional maintenance, lower physical plant depreciation, and an increase in academic flexibility.

6. In an era of decreased faculty mobility, presidents view the summer period as an opportunity to foster faculty vitality and renewal. The summer period is seen as a good time for faculty to pursue research interests, and it is up to the presidents to see that faculty development grants and institutionally-controlled research funds are available. Institutions that are able to fund faculty research projects during summer gain substantially, because the lazy, hazy days are productive ones which help faculty members remain on the cutting edges of their disciplines.

7. The presidents' expectation is shared with faculty that summer employment can flesh out faculty salaries, thus making the institution more competitive with private and more affluent institutions. The prediction was made that soon collegiate institutions will harvest the bitter fruit of paying faculty too little with the consequence that a vast majority of the best students seek careers outside of academe.

8. Use of the summer session as a means of recruiting and retaining students was an expectation of some presidents. Programs for high school students with escrowed academic credit are increasingly popular along with the offering of traditional high school camps. Opportunities can be provided also for regular students to take difficult courses in a more relaxed environment free from demands of heavy schedules during other terms. Summer was viewed by presidents as an ideal time to offer programs designed to help specially-admitted students from disadvantaged backgrounds overcome deficiencies.

9. Presidents expect that both credit and non-credit programs will be offered during summer for place-bound or time-bound employed persons such as teachers, social service workers, technical specialists, health care practitioners, and the like. Self-sustaining non-credit courses and activities offer opportunities for innovation, increased utilization of facilities, additional faculty compensation, opportunity for infusing new blood into institutional arteries when such activities attract outside experts to campus, and opportunities for the recruitment of non-traditional students.

10. The expectation was expressed that summer session become increasingly involved in helping foster the institutional thrust of internationalizing the curriculum. In a shrinking world of increasingly interdependent nations and peoples, the summer period is seen as an ideal time for faculty members to organize trips abroad that are interrelated with specific courses and/or programs.

Prospects

There is not a high level of concurrence among summer term administrators and other college leaders concerning the philosophy, role, and function of summer sessions and their relationship to the overall purpose(s) of higher education. This is the case generally if the summer term has not been incorporated as an integral part of the operation. Indeed, summer session seems to have let the need establish itself without much clarity of purpose and without well-formulated, articulated, and institutionally approved goals.

Collegiate summer sessions are viewed in various ways by the educational community, and the conceptualization is often based on custom and tradition rather than a consequence of thoughtful planning. Both the research findings and campus visitations during the 1980s decade indicate that summer session has not been a topic of high priority among collegiate decision makers. Until and unless boards of trustees, directors, regents and administrators realize the opportunity and need to serve the modern-day needs for higher education during the entire year on an equitable basis for students of all ages, ethnic backgrounds, and economic status, little change is expected to occur regarding the nature and characteristics of summer terms. Only slightly more than one-fourth of the institutions have already recognized demands of the modern world. As long as the higher education system continues to operate on an antiquated agrarian oriented schedule of educational delivery, little change may be expected in the near future. The present trend in some parts of the country, especially the Northwest and Western portions of the country, toward financial self-support of summer educational programs/activities is antithetical to the educational interests of the nation and of society itself.

Some persons ensconced in positions as directors of summer sessions who would be remiss to see the system changed constitute part of the status quo problem. Most are concerned with the mechanics of operation to keep their jobs alive rather than with the philosophical and ideological questions relating to the role of higher education in American society and the changes which are needed to cope with the demands of a changing society. With the recognition that there always will be problems of budgeting, meeting special needs of students, and effectively organizing summer session, the full potential of summer programming will not be realized until:

1. Summer programming is put in the context of the total educational needs of modern day society. Historically, it has been during periods of national crisis that many institutions have changed to accommodate emergency needs for higher education on a year-round equitable basis. It is hoped that the severity of peaceful demand and societal conditions will dictate change for the future, and that more collegiate institutions, especially the public ones will accommodate the need on an equitable basis the year around.

2. The manner by which summer session helps meet modern day educational needs as well as making contributions in a special way are identified and accepted.

3. Attitudes of state legislators, directors, regents, trustees, college administrators all change to make summer leaders full professional partners and summer program accepted and appropriately supported both budgetarily and administratively.

4. The reward structure within the university is extended to include summer activities. At present, it is unclear if anything done in summer is helpful to getting ahead in academia--probably a hindrance.

5. The summer session system with all its diversities is institutionalized in terms of defining its role, creating a research base, and refining its professional identity.

Few recent trends and developments portend encouraging prospects. Some significant ones are policy decisions requiring self-support, movement away from "leaders" to "managers" in summer administration, and movement toward use of product marketing and crass business-type approaches to entice students.

Future prospects seem compounded on another front. Some younger and less experienced scholars of higher education have questioned how status and descriptive studies of summer sessions/terms fit into a theoretical construct for the study of higher education. In the main, such persons are part probably of a clique thinking of higher education as it has always been provided and delivered. They seem insensitive to the need to know the status of conditions before they can be examined in the light of educational, social, political, or economic theories. It is hoped some of the normative type research, alluded to in previous chapters, will have provided a base necessary and suggestions for more analytical and theoretical oriented research by scholars. There exists a possibility that with researchers and practitioners working together, the summer-time portion of total collegiate operation will cease to be eclipsed and relegated to the academic doldrums.

A major problem seems to be in the minds and attitudes especially of those responsible for public higher education in the United States. Presidents, Provosts, and Boards of Regents/Directors in a majority of collegiate institutions are still conceptualizing them as they were in the agrarian society, apparently oblivious of the changed nature of clientele and demands for higher educational opportunities. One is very hard pressed to rationalize why higher educational programs/activities offered during one part of the year should be subject to any different methods of funding, planning, or administration than those provided during any other part of the year. The hope for the future may be the examples provided by approximately one-fourth of the higher education institutions in the United States that have discarded the traditional notion that collegiate education worth public support occurs only between late August or September and early May or June.

As part of the state's obligation to educate its citizenry at whatever levels and in whatever fields are required by the economic manpower demands of society, compatible with individual interests and potentials, a serious question arises as to why educational programs and activities during any part of the year should be financed and administered differently than during any other part of the year? The old adage, "Whatever is worth doing is worth doing well," seems to apply. The potential is great--in fact, summer sessions regularly serve from one-third to 40% of the number of students enrolled during any other term. The challenge is to recognize summer programs in a more positive, meaningful, and thoughtful way in planning to meet institutional goals and to achieve the mission.

Summary

Problems, issues, and trends identified by summer session/term administrators with few exceptions are, in general, focused on the mechanics of operation. They stem from the conditions regarding implementation. Little attention seems to focus on the broader philosophical context including the role and place of summer-time operations as a part of higher education in America. Presidents on the other hand seemed concerned about the extent to which the summer portion of the collegiate operation could be used as a tool for fostering the institutional thrust, for getting more students, for encouraging faculty creativity and renewal, for achieving some cost-effectiveness regarding facility utilization and supplementing faculty salaries, and for public relations purposes.

This chapter raises several significant questions. Are the concerns of summer administrators reflective of an evolving status change from being a highly esteemed professional to that of performing a clerical-managerial institutional role? Is the trend in some portions of the country toward fiscal self-support inimical to the purported objectives of higher educational institutions in meeting modern day societal needs? If chief administrative officials allow the summer period to languish under less than the most professional type of leadership needed to stimulate creativity, vitality, renewal, and productivity in aligning programs to emerging needs, what is the long- range consequence?

Chapter 10 -- Endnotes

1. Willard M. Deal, Jr., "Major Problems of Summer Session Administration," Study conducted for the Research Committee of the North American Association of Summer Sessions, June 1977 (Unpublished); Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall, Relationships of Selected Factors to Summer Session Organizational Structure (Calgary: University of Calgary, Continuing Education Faculty, 1982); John E. Miller, "Factors Associated with Summer Sessions in Selected United States Liberal Arts Colleges" (Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1989).

2. Raymond J. Young and William P. McDougall, Relationships of Selected Factors to Summer Session Organizational Structure (Calgary: University of Calgary, Continuing Education Faculty, 1982), 34-37.

3. Ibid.

4. Raymond J. Young, Summer Sessions in Public Two-Year Colleges, Monograph Series (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1989), 54-5.

5. Lloyd I. Watkins, "A President's Expectation of the Summer Session," Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual Conference of the North American Association of Summer Sessions (St. Louis: The Association, 1986).

CHAPTER 11

EVALUATION OF SUMMER TERM PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

A sage educator once suggested that the process of education and learning without systematic testing, evaluation, and feedback was like blindly groping in the dark hoping that all is well. And while colleges and universities have a long standing tradition of program evaluation and assessment in general, systematic evaluation efforts at the institutional levels and particularly for summer term programs may be the exception rather than the rule.

There appears to be a heightened interest in those aspects of evaluation labeled program review and performance assessment at all levels of higher education. Increased motivation for such activity can probably be attributed to the need for accountability especially during periods of budget constraints, heightened expectations of legislative groups and the public, as well as interest of professionals in improving the quality of education. Despite the increased visibility and public outcry for more evaluative information, considerable controversy and confusion continues to surround the concepts of evaluation and assessment as related to purposes, processes, and manner in which the results may be utilized.

A clear picture of the status and extent of systematic evaluation and/or assessment is difficult to learn. Research by Barak indicated that over three-fourths of all colleges and universities were doing some sort of program review as defined by individual institutions.[1] More recently a survey co-sponsored by the Education Commission of the States and the State Higher Education Executive Officers revealed that formal initiatives labeled "assessment" have been enacted at the state Higher Education Board and legislative levels in over two-thirds of the states indicating a heightened expression of interest at central planning levels.[2] Most of the initiatives allow considerable institutional autonomy, and it is evident that the manner by which evaluation and assessment is perceived is diverse and evolving. According to a recent study conducted by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Research and Development Division of its entire membership, 330 (59.8%) of the institutions responding indicated they either did not have or were not developing assessment programs. Only 19% were actively developing an assessment program, and only 4.4% indicated that statewide boards were involved in the initiative process.[3] These data indicate that heightened state level interest has not yet translated into action at the institutional level. Upon contacting all officers of the North American Association of Summer Session Administrators and the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators and some officials of the American Association of Higher Education, and of Higher Education Boards of fifty states the author found that evaluation and assessment for summer term activity could not be identified except to the extent that it might be following trends applicable to the academic year.

The evaluation and assessment of summer term programs presents unique and diverse problems making the process different from program reviews during the academic year. Major differences occur in the manner in which summer sessions are governed and programmed. As detailed in Chapter 4, funding for about one-half of the summer programs in state collegiate institutions and a greater percentage in private ones is partially or totally dependent on self-support. In fact, it is frequently expected that the financial returns from summer school programs will contribute to the general university budget. Consequently, a key indicator of the success of the program will be revenue generated, and marketing strategies are given greater emphasis than during the academic year. Also, governance of summer programs is frequently shared with continuing education or outreach branches of the university, and, as such, may follow different rules regarding academic requirements, scheduling, and staffing. Differences are also perceived regarding the role and function of summer programs as noted also in Chapter 4. Greater emphasis is placed on instruction, remediation, and development of innovations all of which require somewhat different emphasis in evaluation. Despite differences, summer programs in general follow standard rules and principles of educational evaluation, and it is to this end that this chapter is addressed.

Historical Antecedents

Some types of program evaluation, including the assessment of student performance, have accompanied college and university activities since their very beginning. For example, existence of various types of examination systems have been associated with the success or failure of academic programs, and they have been a part of academic accountability from the beginning of the college and university system.[4] One author asserts that contemporary concern with program review and evaluation finds its origin in the 17th century at Harvard College where in 1642 nine graduates were given a public examination by the external Board of Overseers. At the first college commencement exercise in America, students were required to demonstrate their learning in the classical languages and their skills in disputation on both philological and philosophical theses. The first Harvard degrees were conferred on those students who "received the approbation of the overseers" owing to their proficiency in the tongues of the arts.[5] The tradition of academic program evaluation that began at Harvard has, in various forms, continued to the present. In addition to assessment of student performance, examination of the curriculum has become a routine part of most college and university plans utilizing various types of leadership and committee structure to study and consider needed change in the formal courses of study. There continues to exist in U.S. higher education an on-going discussion between those who defend a classical curriculum and democratic forces hoping to effect change in educational patterns to meet contemporary knowledge and research demands.

As Cronbach has suggested, "thinkers" for centuries have had visions of a society that could make truth the basis for social choice.[6] The college and university as a major social institution with its share of "thinkers" has in this view been prone to examine itself and increasingly to gather better information concerning its role and performance in meeting the needs of society--in general to evaluate its effectiveness. As in most social action research, educational program evaluation has proceeded in sprints and slumps with many changes in direction. Typically evaluation has been motivated by the need for reform because of economic or social conditions.

The vast expansion of the city school systems in the 1920's, the progressive education movement of the 1930's which spawned aggressive experimentation with new content materials and methods, and the influx of veterans returning to colleges and universities from the war years in the 40s, 50s and 60s required that educational evaluation be expanded and diversified. This action was further supported by the outpouring of new programs and materials in mathematics, science and foreign language and the enormous number of new programs designed to provide equality of educational opportunity. Increased federal expenditures during the 60s resulted in a host of federally funded programs, most of which included evaluation components. The 1970s and 80s, because of economic conditions, required careful accounting of resources with accompanying evaluation resulting frequently in retrenchment, reorganization, and sharper focus of educational goals. The accountability movement which surfaced in the 70s has been felt at all levels and persists to date.

The Contemporary Scene

Currently at the higher education level, there is a renewed emphasis on program evaluation and assessment. Fiscal accountability and rebirth of the concept of educational excellence are key motivating factors. Rossman and El-Kawas cited three explanations for the current move towards assessment.[7] They were: (1) Perceived Weakness of Higher Education. They report the contention of some observers that current college practices, rooted in the early 1970s are shoddy, lenient, and out-of-date. Their arguments claim that curricula at many colleges and universities is uneven, lacks overall coherence, and reflects very little attention to what students are actually learning. Others see a back-lash against open access policies and a call for returning to the basics and restoring stringent expectations. (2) Trends in the Workplace. There are dramatic changes taking place in the occupational needs of the American workplace and economy which result in an increased demand for workers with stronger academic skills. The needs of an information society with automated high technology industries have created an urgent need for workers with good reading and mathematics skills and the ability to handle complex tasks. (3) Political Pressure. With the increased role of state governments, often troubled with economic problems and cuts in federal programs, state officials are faced with a new level of responsibility for the quality and accountability of higher education.

Within this context, both the public schools and the colleges and universities are being asked to respond. At the K-12 level, the response has been mainly the expansion of testing programs and some increase in self-study accreditation approaches. According to a recent survey of accountability reporting conducted by the State Education Assessment Center of the Council of Chief State School Officers with 49 states responding, 44 (89.8%) have student achievement assessment reporting to the state level.[8] An Education Commission of the States report indicated that by November 1985 41 states required some kind of minimal competency tests, and 17 used tests for graduation. Diagnostic testing for instructional improvement is required in a majority of the states.[9] As these data indicate, emphasis at the K-12 level is clearly on performance testing, and a major focus is on evaluating the quality of elementary and secondary schools.

At the higher education level, by March 1987 two-thirds of all states had formal initiatives labeled "assessment." The variety of approaches is considerable, and the trend among state authorities is to grant institutional prerogative in the design and conduct of the assessment. However, in approximately one-fourth of the states, the development of some kind of assessment procedures appears to be mandated. Performance assessment, whether by testing or some other means, appears to be a developing and important part of university evaluation. In fact, the study reports that in the large majority of states, the Higher Education Boards are acting to facilitate and to support evaluation and assessment procedures. Faculty and institutional leaders are being asked to respond to the challenge of designing and carrying out plans to determine the effectiveness of their programs.[10]

Definition of Terms and Concepts Relating to Program Evaluation

The concept of educational evaluation is a "coat of many colors." In its simplest form, evaluation can be described as a systematic process of determining the worth or merit of an educational practice or product with reference to some accepted standard or criterion. A terminology jungle surrounds the concept, and the perceived meaning is shaped both by historical connotations and the current social context and developing evaluation theories.

Historically, Wittrock and Wiley distinguished among three different approaches identified as measurement, evaluation, and assessment.[11] Measurement involved the reduction of information to a standard quantitative metric. Evaluation was defined in the context of the Tylerian logic and referred to a set of procedures for measuring changes in students following the objectives of instruction. Assessment followed in the historical context of World War II.[12] In this sense, it reflected the measurement of individuals' characteristics in relation to a particular environment, task, or criterion situation. Assessment was concerned as much with the environment as it was with the individuals who interacted with the environment. Presently, testing and measurement are generally viewed as the act of determining the degree or amount of a given characteristic or phenomenon, i.e., status determination, and evaluation is viewed as a broader concept involving the determination of worth or merit as related to criteria or standards. The criteria or standards may be set in context by one of many models such as accreditation procedures, goal attainment models, or decision or policy-oriented guidelines.

The concept of assessment which has most often been utilized interchangeably with measurement is now frequently considered a euphemism for evaluation. The current and popular use of the term assessment in higher education literature appears to imply a broad view of the concept closely akin to evaluation but not specifically defining the basis on which value judgments are made. The Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation states that assessment is a multi-trait, multi-method technique, implying that it involves a number of variables (rather than a single measurement such as a test) and uses a number of different procedures to measure them.[13] Data and evidence may also be gathered from different sources. This concept seems to be consistent with current perceptions in the higher education assessment community.

The concept of "performance assessment" is much more clear, usually referring to student performance involving more than tested outcomes of instruction. This concept includes both content and process and refers to the account of what students can be expected to take away from their educational programs. The notion of accountability has also appeared frequently in the literature, as there has been great emphasis in recent years on educational accountability. Educational accountability requires that the institution deliver acceptable evidence to the taxpayers or other commissioning agents to verify that an expectation or standard has been met, e.g., the taxpayers are satisfied that they are getting their money's worth. Accountability efforts usually incorporate evaluation studies but are distinct in that they require attention to the demands for evidence by an external agency.

A concept recently appearing in the literature and now frequently used in higher education is "value-added assessment." Value-added assessment typically examines actual or inferred changes over a period of time, e.g., pre-post tests, and attempts to separate that portion of student growth or learning that may be attributed to a defined set of educational experiences compared to those which might be due to general motivation or differences in ability patterns. This concept answers such questions as: what changes in student's attitudes, skills, values, problem-solving ability or motivational patterns are a result of any defined part of the net effect of the college experience? In general, it attempts to answer the question, what is the value of the educational experience? While the concept is controversial as to its practicality and somewhat varied as defined by different authors, it is definitely an idea of current attention in higher education assessment.

Purposes of Evaluation

The decision to evaluate an educational program sends out many different kinds of signals. In a logical vein the decision suggests the need to know the answers to such questions as: Which aspects of the program are acceptable? Which areas need improvement or change? Are the processes of quality education properly in place and functioning? How well are students learning? Is the program cost acceptable? How do others perceive the program? Evaluation may also be threatening and insinuate that students, faculty, and administrators are not doing well and need to be "evaluated." Great anxiety may be created by the process of evaluation or assessment if the purpose(s) are not clearly understood and accepted by those involved.

As Hutchings and Ruben stated, "When you undertake an institutional process of assessment, you put the competence of your faculty to test. It's an enormous opportunity for some and a challenge for others."[14] They state further that assessment has much to do with heightened visions of what is possible and implies more rigorous expectations for students and faculty. It may mean squabbles, headaches, and a threat to faculty autonomy which will be dealt with constructively by some and soundly resisted by others. While these comments are about assessment rather than the more generalized concept of evaluation, the message is the same.

The decision to evaluate or assess is also cumulative, and the outcome is likely to be irreversible within an institution. Once an evaluation plan is developed and information gathered, it is not likely that institutional patterns will remain the same. In this sense, knowledge is power and behavior of the leaders, faculty, and students will likely be changed having received feedback concerning the success, failure, or adequacy of their part of the educational enterprise.

A fellow summer director in conversation emphasized the importance of "why" before designing an evaluation and the need to be extremely clear concerning the purpose.[15] She cited the danger of gathering unneeded or irrelevant information that may be utilized in a destructive rather than helpful manner. Indeed, clarity or purpose is called for, given the environment of heightened expectations currently surrounding higher education including summer programs. Purposes must be clearly stated, justification provided, and audiences informed regarding the process and ultimate use of evaluation information.

Conrad and Wilson stated that most institutions involved in program review and evaluation seem to emphasize either program improvement or resource reallocation including program discontinuance.[16] They cited the institutional statement of review purposes at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville as a typical reflection of these emphases. They were:

1. To improve the quality of the University's academic offerings,
2. To achieve the best use of resources,
3. To foster cooperation among the academic and administrative units,
4. To evaluate quality, productivity, need and demand within the University, state and region,
5. To determine effectiveness and consider possible modification, and
6. To facilitate academic planning and budgeting.[17]

The foregoing list provides typical institutional statements of program evaluation goals. However, to be of value in the context of summer programs, such lists must be operationalized and integrated with summer session goals and objectives. As pointed out in previous chapters, goal statements are often lacking for summer programs and thus perpetrators of evaluation efforts for summer session will need to communicate widely in setting the goals for evaluative efforts--large or small and at any level--departmental, college, or central administration.

Grandiose evaluative efforts within an institution often do not result in achieving desired aims. They tend to be too "all inclusive," threatening, and misconstrued and/or strongly resisted by those who are expected to make changes. Modest evaluation or assessment efforts with rather specific objectives presented in an unobtrusive, common sense manner tend to be most effective. After interviewing a group of college and university leaders as part of a Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) funded American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) effort, Hutchings, Director of the AAHE Assessment Forum, recounted that member suggested assessment is guided by rather obvious, common-sensical questions an institution might ask of itself. The questions were:

Who are our students and why do they come here?
What do they know when they arrive?
What should a graduate be like?
How do students change and why?
What factors lead students to withdraw?
What do employers say about our graduates?
How do students talk about their own learning?
Is there a better way to organize the curriculum?
What are the strengths of the institution?
How could we do better?[18]

These are meaningful questions focused mostly on student performance. Similar questions could be created about the many aspects of summer programming and formulated as foci for evaluation and assessment. Specific questions about programming, marketing, and budgeting will be needed also.

Three commonly accepted purposes of evaluation are instructional improvement, accountability, and planning and resource allocation. And, the expectation will be to achieve more than one of the foregoing purposes simultaneously. Because of this, evaluative efforts may be at "cross purposes" as to methodology, expectations, and distribution of results. For example, some audiences may be interested in direct outcomes of the instructional program, e.g., tested skills and performance; others may be more attentive to the process of instruction or the design of a system within the university. Evaluation may be motivated also by the need to be accountable to an external agent such as a state Higher Education Board or a federal funding agency which advances specific criteria that may not have been internalized within the institution or classroom. Such different points of view must be recognized and understood if evaluation is to be positive and helpful. A brief discussion of the various categories follows.

Program Evaluation for Instructional Improvement

Research in psychology and education has clearly established the validity of feedback for improvement of learning and instruction. Recent emphasis on evaluation and performance assessment has aroused the concept of assessment for improvement of instruction involving feedback that bears directly on the actions of teachers and learners. An excellent discussion of this point of view is advanced by Cross who proposed that the real potential of assessment is feedback in the classroom.[19] She stated that feedback from any assessment must reach teachers and be perceived by them as relevant to the way they do their jobs. She stated further that classroom teachers need direct involve ment in the assessment movement for the following reasons.

1. Teachers need continuous feedback on learning in the classroom, so they may evaluate, experiment, and improve the effectiveness of their teaching and its impact on students' learning.
2. Continuous feedback is necessary for improvement in both teaching and learning. Teachers need to assess learning, so that they may provide feedback to students on their progress as learners. And teachers need to receive continuous and accurate feedback on the impact of their teaching on the students in their classroom, so that they may improve their teaching.
3. Finally, if improvement of learning is the goal, we need to know more about how students learn.

She stated that classroom teachers who know the structure of their discipline and who know--or should know--the problems encountered by students in learning it are in the best position to contribute to knowledge on teaching effectiveness. Research on teaching and learning is moving in the direction of studying cognition and learning in the context of the subject or content taught. Participation of discipline-oriented faculty is needed in assessment and research on teaching and learning, so it can be known how best to improve the process.[20] The importance of feedback with a focus on improving the instructional program from students to teachers, teachers to students, and to colleagues as well as feedback from consultants and experts was described. Certainly the emphasis on classroom and instructional improvement deserves careful consideration in setting program evaluation goals for summer programs, since central emphasis for most summer session programs is on instruction.

Program Evaluation for Accountability Purposes

Education in the U.S. has had a long standing tradition of demonstrating the effectiveness to a variety of external audiences including parents, elected officials, and other responsible agencies. In fact, the current assessment movement which is intimately associated with evaluation in the broader context has been done for accountability purposes as well as for instructional improvement. The statement of Missouri's governor who chaired the Governor's Task Force on College Quality, characterized the accountability point of view. He said, "The public has the right to know what it is getting for its expenditure of tax resources: the public has a right to know and understand the quality of undergraduate education that young people receive from publicly funded colleges and universities."[21] While demands from agencies vary greatly it would appear that education has obligations both to demonstrate that they are carrying out their assigned responsibilities as well as providing certain information about performance outcomes of their efforts. Ewell stated, "... because state authority is ultimately responsible for maintenance of the higher education asset as a whole, it must argue for two distinct kinds of accountability.

First, institutions may be required to provide information on actual performance. Examples include:

1. Persistence and program completion rates for particular demographic and economic / educationally disadvantaged populations,
2. Graduation, job placement, and certification/performance rates in selected occupations or professional demand important to attaining state economic development goals, and
3. Mastery of minimal basic skills in reading, writing, and computation and evaluation of the effectiveness of remediation.

Secondly, given the state's legitimate responsibility for maintaining the higher education asset, institutions may appropriately be held accountable for particular processes or functions assumed to contribute to instructional effectiveness. Among these are:

1. Mission and review analysis, including specification of the kinds of instructional outcomes intended,
2. Evaluation of the effectiveness of general education programs,
3. Evaluation of the outcomes of individual degree programs,
4. Evaluation of student satisfaction and goal attainment, and
5. Utilization of assessment results in institutional decision making processes.

He argued that it is consistent with state responsibility to present evidence that they are engaged in each of these processes in a meaningful way.[22] In addition to state reporting there is responsibility to account to other agencies such as accreditation agencies, consumer protection agencies, and various funding agencies. The processes of assessment and evaluation constitutes the core of most of these accountable requirements.

Evaluation for Planning and Resource Allocation

Frequently, program evaluation is linked to budget requests, resource allocations, and program modification. In fact, most colleges and universities maintain information on a continuing basis, so evaluative judgments may be made at the time of resource allocations. While it is not yet common to gather test performance data of students at the institutional level, the trend to consider indicators relating to success records of students and faculty is often integrated with the usual basic statistics such as enrollment, expenditures, and personnel qualifications routinely kept in most data files. These data can then be utilized to assist with the planning and budget allocation processes.

An example is taken from Washington State University's "State of Principles and Procedures for Unit Evaluation" where the following is stated as part of the purpose of biennial reporting. "The principle purpose of the biennial report is to establish an information base to be related to unit objectives for program evaluation and planning. These reports may be used internally within the university as follows:

1. Serve as a context in which to analyze specific budget requests,
2. Identify needs for intensive program review,
3. Facilitate coordination among units with shared goals and interests,
4. Provide a data base for the preparation of Council for Post-Secondary reports and evaluation and accreditation reviews."[23]

In the context of budget allocations and program change, including possible discontinuance of programs, evaluation is cast into a context of very real meaning to units participating. It may be perceived as unpopular, threatening, and distasteful rather than opportunity for desirable changes and needed improvements.

Summary of Criteria for Purposes

An excellent summary list of criteria to guide the preparation of goals and purposes of evaluation has been provided by Brinkerhoff et al.[24] Defensible criteria suggested for an evaluation study are:

CLEAR	The purpose is understood by key audiences.
ACCESSIBLE	The evaluation purpose has been documented and disseminated to those who might be affected by the evaluation or who have a right to know about it.
USEFUL	The commitment to use the evaluation is real and the action to be taken has been anticipated.
RELEVANT	The information needed for the evaluation has been identified and could serve the program.
HUMANE	Given the potential and fiscal support, it is realistic to believe that the evaluation can be successfully implemented without having people involved or affected.
COMPATIBLE	The evaluation seems to be compatible with the principle goals of the program, its staff, the larger institutional setting, and the target audience.
WORTHWHILE	The potential benefits of the evaluation justify it likely costs.

Criteria for defensible purposes of evaluation must be balanced also by possible pitfalls or predetermined decisions beyond the control of the evaluators. Common pitfalls that undermine evaluative efforts include:

1. Audiences frequently interpret the evaluative findings in terms of their own objectives or biases not in accord with the stated goals.
2. The stated purposes of the evaluation are often written to satisfy a bureaucratic need and do not have real meaning or worth to target audiences.
3. Achieving the stated goals may produce debilitating anxiety if the results of the evaluation are implemented despite the fact that the legitimacy of the goals can be established.
4. Evidence that decisions relating to the evaluation study have already been made and the effort to obtain evidence relating to stated goals is superfluous.

Approach to the Evaluation Process

Having identified the goals and objectives, an important step in the evaluation process is to determine precisely the target or focus of the evaluation. The focus may range from a single course, departmental unit, defined cluster of activities such as a new program or institute, to a total college or summer session. While the focus of the evaluation may seem obvious, it should be clearly defined to prevent any misunderstandings. For example, a departmental unit could include the academic program only or it could also include personnel, support services, budgetary process, administration, and cooperating agencies. Particularly when an intensive review is conducted, a logical framework identifying all aspects of the unit under study needs to be developed. Such a framework will facilitate communication, reporting, and selection of evaluation criteria. Seldom is the definition of the unit of evaluation simple or singular nor is there a generic definition which fits all colleges and universities even for such common units as departments.

Evaluation of summer programs may be approached internally within a unit, externally, or utilizing cooperation or mixed approaches. Internal evaluation or self-study processes typically involve faculty and students and/or former students within a program. Self-study may be motivated by a professional desire for improvement in connection with a new program being conducted on an experimental basis or in conjunction with a cyclical plan adopted within the university such as accreditation studies, annual or biennial reporting requirements, or a Higher Education Commission mandate. External reviews may involve evaluators external to the college or university or may be conducted by persons within the institution but external to the unit being evaluated.

The context in which the review takes place strongly influences the approach to evaluation. For example, the dramatic shift to evaluation for accountability purposes the past few years usually requires external evaluators to help ensure objectivity and credibility. Such acts as reallocation of resources or possible discontinuance of programs require the most objective reporting and adherence to standards which may be difficult to achieve internally because of self interests and familiarity within an institution.

An increasingly recognized approach to college or university evaluation is a two-stage plan. During the first stage the university engages in self-study which may be a part of a routine or on-going review. In such instances where discrepancies are noted, major shifts in resources suggested, or new or experimental programs introduced, an external team of evaluators may be employed to conduct more intensive studies. Such teams may include professional peers, outside consultants, and professional evaluators. These contracted agents may be used not only to lend objectivity to findings but also to help identify new perspectives and directions for a program or institutional process. Washington State University has developed such a plan requiring an on-going biennial review process which is linked to budget allocation with a second stage intensive review called for when discrepancies are noted or more in-depth study is judged necessary by the commissioners of the evaluative study.[25]

The question of "who" is qualified to be an evaluator deserves special mention. Often it is felt that some experience in the field along with the ability to talk to people qualifies a person to be an evaluator. More cautious contractors require many years of experience and extensive recommendations that the potential evaluator has high credibility. While experience, ability to interact, and recognized credibility are desirable traits, they should not be utilized alone for convenience or expediency in selecting evaluators. Research as to who makes the best evaluator is lacking, but experience suggests that certain qualities are essential whether evaluation is done by a single person or a team. Those qualities include:

1. Familiarity and background in the unit being studied. For example, if an innovative program in foreign language is being studied, a perceptive and successful foreign language expert should be included; if a budget management system is being studied, a person knowing budget and fiscal fields should be involved; if summer session administration is being reviewed, a recognized summer school administrator should be involved. The larger the unit being evaluated the more team members or advisors are required.

2. Personal and professional credibility. Since objectivity, fairness, and ability to set aside biases to arrive at a balanced point of view are prime requisites of successful evaluations, the selection of persons must be thoughtful after thorough investigation. Selection of evaluators who are members of "the good old boys club" or because the individual is a "nice person and will likely cooperate" is a common criticism of evaluation studies, for such selections usually invalidate or at least diminish the impact of the study. Credibility also implies adherences to the highest

levels of ethical behaviors.

3. Organization and communication skills. Evaluative studies involve coordination of efforts and input from various sources. Ability to write well as in the reporting process and possession of good interview skills are required. The capacity to present findings to an audience and to field questions openly is essential.

4. Knowledge and skill in research and evaluation design. Knowledge and experience with research and evaluation design and with data analysis techniques, including statistical tests and data processing, are important and paramount.

It is not likely that all of the characteristics listed above can be found in a single person's qualifications. Should budgetary restriction prevent contracting with a team, it may be possible to utilize needed persons in an advisory capacity. Advisers should be also selected for specific purposes with care.

Frequently an institution will appoint persons to serve as evaluators who may be experts in their field but who are not sensitive to the mainstream of the theory and activity of the unit being evaluated. In such cases, the results of the evaluation may be either innocuous or destructive depending on how aggressive is the participation. Such appointments should be avoided at the time of commissioning the evaluative study.

Cronbach has suggested that professional evaluators of social programs need training involving four difference components: (1) disciplinary preparation at the doctoral level--in a social science, (2) participation in dozens of interdisciplinary summer sessions that examine evaluators, (3) an apprenticeship to practicing evaluators, and (4) an internship in an agency where policy is formulated.[26] To the extent that education is regarded as a social program, relevance can be found in most of the recommendations. In the absence of such qualifications, perhaps the single most important qualifications are personal and professional honesty and credibility and mainstream involvement with the field or discipline being studied.

Evaluation Models

The oldest type of evaluation is the accreditation approach with which most professionals are intimately acquainted. Educationally, the formalization of this model dates back to the turn of the century when the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges was founded on March 29-30, 1895, by the presidents of the Universities of Michigan, Wisconsin, Chicago, and Northwestern University and three secondary school principals. This new regional association had by 1910 developed the accreditation policies that became its trademark.[27] Virtually all professional fields answer to accreditation agencies which have become powerful sources in stimulating revenue and upgrading of programs both at the common school and the higher education levels. Typically, accreditation covers all aspects of the program, utilizes association standards and criteria, and employs external evaluation teams identified as "experts" in the field. Lists of qualified evaluators are identified by various accreditation agencies for each specialty area. Accreditation procedures, usually under the direction of a central accredita tion agency, attempt to determine if processes judged necessary for quality results are being carried out within the unit. Such processes include: establishing philosophy and setting goals, employing qualified faculty and other personnel, developing workable organizational patterns, offering well designed instructional programs, providing support services and proper equipment, and adequacy of supplies and building facilities. More recently emphasis has been placed on the inclusion of an existing plan for feedback and evaluation from the learners within the unit being evaluated.

Tyler's famous evaluation rationale became prominent in the 1940s and was based on his experience in the Eight Year Study of the 1930s.[28] Behaviorally defined objectives and measurement of change toward the end of achieving the stated objectives represent the central focus of Tyler's approach. Steps in this model are:

1. Formulate objectives.
2. Classify objectives.
3. Define objectives in behavioral terms.
4. Suggest situations in which achievement will be shown.
5. Develop or select appraisal techniques.
6. Gather and interpret performance data.

This rationale has been widely used in curriculum development and evaluation as well as for the centerpiece of evaluation strategies regarding many federally funded programs.

Both the accreditation and Tylerian objective based model have continued to be prominent in higher education. In fact, nearly all universities and colleges subscribe to accreditation procedures on a cyclical review calendar to help insure credibility of programs and institutions on a nation-wide basis. Graduates from accredited institutions generally have advantages on the employment market. Parenthetically and perhaps unfortunately, there are no formal accrediting agencies that deal directly with summer school programs except only as they may be integrated with the total university programs.

Goal-based evaluation drives academic program review in the majority of colleges and universities, and though it can vary as to complexity, essential elements are:

1. Clarification of goals and objectives of the program reviewed,
2. Identification of factors affecting performance,
3. Determination of criteria and standards against which performance will be assessed,
4. Development of techniques and procedures for collecting data,
5. Data collection,
6. Comparison of data with the previously identified criteria and standards, leading to a judgment of worth, and
7. Communication of the findings.[29]

The usefulness of the foregoing approaches has proved worthy but inadequate. More recently there has been a recognition that evaluation is a complex process with a multiplicity of goals requiring a wide variety of approaches. For example, through his research Astin indicated that evaluation must take into account a multiplicity of variables, including input as well as output, a variety of learner characteristics such as sex, values and other affective qualities, environmental factors, and follow-up results. Accordingly holistic assessment methods are required as well as appropriate strategies to arrive at value judgments while considering all these factors.[30]

During the 1960s the evaluation profession began to grow culminating in the development of a number of theoretical models for managing evaluation activity. Such theories emphasize a variety of purposes and accent different ways of obtaining and assimilating evaluative information. In addition to goal-based and accreditation approaches, other models focus upon organizational development, decision making, compliance, cost analysis, experimental results, judgment of connoisseurs, naturalistic observation, and goal-free evaluation. Full discussion of these models is beyond the scope of this chapter, and the reader is referred to Evaluation Models, Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation, a compilation of contemporary models and discussion by the authors and creators.[31] Suffice it to say that evaluators will find value in studying the various approaches, none of which represent complete paradigms by themselves, as an aid for gaining various perspectives of the evaluation process and learning better ways to orchestrate information in the decision making process. The elements described in the following section represent a generalized synthesis which may be applied to any type of evaluative study.

The Evaluation Process

General Principles

Effective evaluation requires an atmosphere of trust and understanding with opportunity for free exchange of ideas. Broadly speaking, an evaluation ought to inform and improve the system. It should function both as a basis for making corrections and alterations (formative evaluation) and for determining the extent to which desired outcomes are achieved (summative evaluation). The following operational principles are earmarks of good evaluative studies.

Participation. The management of the evaluation should ensure the participation of those involved and affected by the evaluation. This principle implies opportunity for input at all stages of the evaluation process including the formulation of goals, conduct of the study, and verification and reporting of the results.

Credibility. All activities of an evaluative study should be carried out in a strictly ethical context. This implies freedom from conflict of interest on the part of the evaluators, full and frank disclosure of all that transpires in the review process, protection of the rights of those evaluated, and open and balanced reporting. Full description of the qualifications of the evaluators should be provided including opportunity for input from the unit being evaluated. Any "hidden agendas" will diminish the credibility of evaluative results, regardless of underlying motives.

Practicality. The usefulness of the evaluation should be established. This includes consideration of how results will be utilized, who will be affected, and whether implementation of outcomes is feasible in light of resources or other environmental constraints. Evaluation studies should relate to the central mission of the unit being studied, and the possibilities for informing and improving that unit should be documented.

Accuracy. Information used in the evaluation should be valid, reliable, and representative. Instruments utilized should undergo rigorous procedures in preparation with careful controls in administration and sampling. Subjective information must be carefully classified and methods and qualifications of the observer(s) documented.

Communication. Communication between the evaluator(s) and the principle actors (stakeholders) should continue at all stages of the study. Procedure and timing for the review, receipt and deliberation of report, and implementation of results should be made known.

Purpose

Central to the purpose of any evaluation study is an understanding of the motivation for the study. Or, put more simply, answers to why is the evalua tion being conducted?

Summer programs are excluded frequently from on-going evaluations in collegiate institutions, and thus the reason for evaluation needs to be carefully detailed. Often summer session program evaluation is linked to the introduction of a new course, institute, or specialized unit, since summer is a time for innovation and experimentation. Budget modifications may require value judgments concerning priorities for elimination or continuance. Reorganizations might accompany the hiring of a new summer term director who may wish to instigate evaluations. Administrative judgments or recommendations from an advisory committee may also motivate evaluative studies. Whatever the reason(s), the stimulus for evaluation must be clearly understood. Evaluations should not be conducted without good reason. An evaluation without basic purpose may lead to useless or confusing information. The authors have observed that studies are often undertaken without clearly defined goals or purposes in mind--a process which leads to wasted effort and often resentment on the part of those asked to contribute. Accordingly, those who will be affected by the evaluation should participate at all critical stages of the process including an understanding and hopefully acceptance of the basic reason(s) for the study.

Unit of Study

The key question to be answered here is: What precisely will be evaluated? It is necessary to detail inclusions and exclusions, so value judgments are made regarding the intended target and not generalized by implication to other objects or audiences. Even the smallest unit of evaluation has potential for being generalized to a wide variety of audiences. Persons who have a stake in the results may assume that findings reflect indirectly on them by implication making them part of the object of study. For example, the specific unit of study might be performance of students in a particular course. The teacher, faculty of the unit, or even the administrator of the unit may feel they are by implication the object of the study. The structure and context of the evaluation object should be carefully planned and appropriate parameters defined.

Plan of Operation

Systematic evaluation requires a carefully formulated plan of operation or contract which details expectations and limitations on any evaluative study. It is strongly recommended that this plan or contract be in writing, for certainly it is a necessity if the evaluator is an agent outside the unit. Plans may be simple or complex, and a variety of formats may be utilized depending on the institution. Regardless of format, the plan should include the following elements:

1. Description of the context of the evaluative study including the basic purpose(s). Such a description may include what is already known about the unit being evaluated.
2. Philosophy or orientation of the evaluator(s). The theory base from which the evaluators will operate must be understood up front. Will the study be of an accreditation type, emphasize naturalistic observation, employ rigorous scientific design and data gathering techniques, depend mostly on judgment of experts, some combination of these, or other orientations?
3. Basic objectives or questions to be answered by the study.
4. Description of the manner in which various audiences or stakeholders will be involved in the study.
5. Detailed management plan including director, other evaluators or participants, procedures for gathering, processing and reporting data, timelines for each phase of study, and preparation and writing of the report(s).
6. Any special expectations or limitations of the study.
7. To whom the report will be delivered and how the evaluator(s) will be involved in the implementation phase of the results.
8. Budget.

The following draft proposal for the evaluation of the French Language Diploma Program prepared by Dr. Sharon Alexander, Division of University Extension and Continuing Education, University of Victoria, provides an example which illustrates implementation of most of the above suggestions (see Appendix A). More complex designs may be required for other types of units or combination of units.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design will be dictated in large part by the approach or theory of the evaluators. For example, if the Tylerian objective-based model is employed, great care must be given to the preparation of behaviorally defined objectives which lend themselves to measurement or to objectively categorized data. An evaluation study utilizing a rigorous experimental design will require control groups and statistical tests in case of sampling, and leave little room for subjective impressions. A naturalistic or connoisseurship model depends largely on the observation of experts in a natural setting. Some evaluators may use an integrated approach borrowing from all models. In this case, the design needs to specify what information will be gathered using what instruments or processes and how data will be collected, summarized, and evaluated.

A design ultimately should enable the evaluator to have the best information possible to answer the evaluative questions and to determine what results being observed were due to hypothesized causes. It should be noted that different points of view can be used to evaluate information. The results of the study may be referenced to specific objectives and growth or change and subjected to statistical analyses which indicate if the change has exceeded chance occurrence. In other instances it will be necessary to compare data to a norm or acceptable reference group. Some approaches require only the judgment and interpretation of the evaluator in accord with some operationally defined observational approach. In this case the observer or the expert becomes the reference. Status studies frequently employ questionnaire techniques and logical compilations of findings into summary form.

If a summer administrator wishes to conduct a simple student feedback survey regarding the impressions students have of a course, a very unsophisticated design would be called for. Matters of sampling, timing, collecting, and tabulating would be the prime concerns. On the other hand, if a summer administrator wishes to undertake a more complete evaluation of the summer program, many types of information will be needed, and the design should be developed cooperatively with help from persons experienced in evaluation and research design.

Information and Instrumentation

Perhaps the most critical part of an evaluation study is the kind of information that will be utilized and how it will be retrieved or generated. If instruments must be selected or developed, questions arise about how validity, reliability and sensitivity will be assured. Evaluators commonly look to three major sources for information: (1) existing data banks within the institution, (2) data gathered using specially designed or selected instruments, and (3) impressions of expert observers.

Data banks are available in nearly all colleges and universities. Summer administrators participate widely in developing information for marketing, keeping track of enrollment, student credit hours, faculty loads, student characteristics, and the like. Many directors have earmarked leading indicators which help give the pulse of summer activities. Long-term data become most valuable in detecting trends in enrollment, expenditures, staffing, marketing, and other aspects of the summer programming. Data which are helpful to the summer administrator should be incorporated into the central data system and routinely reported. The importance of well defined trend data cannot be overemphasized as a basis for making evaluative judgments. Single data points are of little value, because they may lack reliability.

A second source of information is from specially designed questionnaires, tests, and institutional or employer documents. A wide variety of approaches are now highlighted in the current performance assessment movement including: transcript patterns, attrition and graduation rates, student surveys, graduate school acceptance patterns, evidence on institutional images, employment patterns, placement exam results, quality of senior these, success on professional tests for certification, faculty judgment, interviews, portfolios, and tests. All data gathering strategies have limitations and constitute some of the greatest weaknesses found in evaluation studies. The temptation to use instruments such as standardized tests for convenience and presumably to dignify a study scientifically often leads to selection of tests that don't fit the objectives or measure only minor aspects of the intended outcomes. For example, tests to measure complex behaviors or higher mental processes are difficult to standardize, and they represent an often stated objective of evaluation studies. The convenience and flexibility of questionnaire techniques makes them popular in evaluative studies, but the limitation is great of their truly representing the behaviors of the respondents because of difficulty in attaining adequate samples in the case of mail questionnaires. Problems with observational techniques are numerous as to qualification of observers, sampling, expense, and problems in objectively assembling results. Limitations of all data gathering approaches should be recognized, and the greatest care should always be taken in constructing, field testing, and refining them for final use. Expert assistance in this area is highly recommended.

A third source of commonly used information for evaluation is observational or impressionistic. This type of information is identified by experts in the field who are presumably able to elicit the needed information through selective observation or questioning. Often the observations are guided or structured by written standards or criteria such as in accreditation studies. Results are most valuable when highly skilled and experienced observers are utilized who have been specially trained in observational and interview approaches.

The golden rule regarding all evaluative information is to consider a variety of sources and attempt to cross-validate findings wherever possible. Development of useful instruments to measure complex behaviors or learning outcomes continues to be a troublesome problem.

Assembling and Interpreting Results

A systematic data reporting format should be devised. The format will include timelines, sampling, conditions of instrument administration or information retrieval, data verification, and an organized data presentation format. Institutional policies governing the confidentiality or clearance for certain kinds of information must be observed when involving human subjects. Data analysis may be simple or complex ranging from anecdotal comments to highly sophisticated statistical analysis. In cases where complex analysis is required, it may be necessary to employ assistance in processing the information. It is very important that the interpretations of the data do not go beyond the accuracy and sampling limits of the type of information gathered.

The question of who makes the value judgment concerning the findings of the study deserve special mention. Some points of view hold that the evalua tor should be intimately involved in the decision making or judgment process and even in the follow up implementation of the results. Others contend that the evaluator gathers data, supplies results to the commissioner of the study, and withdraws from the process. The commissioner may ask the evaluator for clarification of the results or for additional information but does not involve the evaluator in the decision making process. The weighing and integration of study results are put into context by the commissioner of the study who makes the final decisions. It is critical that the role of the evaluator be agreed upon at the onset of the study. This will greatly influence possible follow-up efforts as well as eliminate confusion and hard feelings that may arise when evaluators, without prior knowledge, are dealt out of the decision making or value judgment part of the evaluation process.

Reporting

A variety of formats may be required for reporting and must be tailored to different audiences appropriately. Frequently, both a detailed report and some type of executive summary are required for the commissioners of the study. Oral reports open to the public with opportunity for questions and discussion are often helpful. The type of reports required should also be agreed upon at the onset of the study. Reports should be straightforward, organized for clarity of presentation, and free from pedagogy or complicated terminology. They should include final recommendations of the evaluator and limitations as well. It is advisable that the commissioners of the evaluation study be given the opportunity to review a draft of the report prior to final publication. This procedure gives them opportunity to inject requests or suggestions that will make the report more useful not, however, to distort or change results. Other participants may be asked to view a draft copy of the report also to verify the evaluators observations and conclusions prior to final publication. Except in certain cases of personnel assessment, the evaluation report is most frequently an open document and should be written with this in mind. Several excellent documents have been published on the writing of evaluation reports.[32]

Verification

Provisions should be made for full scrutiny of evaluation studies by qualified reviewers who are not aligned with the sponsoring unit or members of the evaluation team. This procedure, while cumbersome and time consuming, accomplishes two objectives: (1) establishes the credibility of the study for even the smallest evaluation effort, e.g., a student survey concerning the effectiveness of a course or special innovative effort, and (2) opportunity to gain another perspective for follow-up study.

Evaluation Standards

There are two comprehensive sets of evaluation standards that have been developed which summer session evaluators should find useful.[33] Both were developed by joint committees with representatives appointed from major professional associations concerned with education. There are 12 for the program standards and 14 for the personnel standards. For both sets of standards, Daniel L. Stufflebeam chaired the joint committees presiding over the writing, field testing, validation, and subsequent publication of these documents. The joint committees were widely representative in nature ensuring a comprehensive and far-reaching perspective. They enjoyed full support of their sponsoring organizations in the development, field testing, and verification of the usefulness of the standards. Organizations represented for each set of standards were as follows:

1. American Association of School Administrators, American Educational Research Association, American Federation of Teachers, American Personnel and Guidance Association, American Psychological Association, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Council for American Private Education, Educational Commission of the States, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Educational Association, National Council on Measurement in Education, and National School Boards Association.

2. American Association of School Administrators, American Association of School Personnel Administrators, American Educational Research Association, American Evaluation Association, American Federation of Teachers, American Psychological Association, Association for Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Education Commission of the States, National Association for Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Council on Measurement in Education, National Education Association, and National School Boards Association.

Standards for the assessment of evaluation in both documents are presented in the broad areas of propriety, utility, feasibility, and accuracy. Presentation of each separate standard is accompanied by a definition and overview, guidelines for use including pitfalls and caveats, and illustrative cases accompanied by analysis and suggestions. The cases are broadly representative of evaluation studies encountered in the field, and an outline is presented together with an analysis of the relative importance or applicability of the standards in performing an evaluation.

Both the program and personnel evaluation standards represent broadly accepted principles and practical guidelines for the organization and assessment of evaluation studies. They are presented in clear readable language and have been recommended by a wide variety of educational agencies for their usefulness in assessing the quality of evaluation studies. Summer Session administrators will find the standards to be of great assistance in formulating evaluation efforts at all levels.

Summary

While there appears to be a heightened interest nationally in program evaluation and performance assessment, summer term programs are still characterized by unsystematic and spotty evaluation efforts. However, political pressures motivated by perceived weakness of higher education and the demand for fiscal accountability constitute major forces which will likely result in more extensive evaluation and assessment of alla levels of higher education including summer programs.

Many important purposes may be served by systematic evaluation and assessments including instructional improvement, accountability, planning and resource allocation. Clear identification of purpose(s) and accompanying pitfalls are key elements of evaluation studies that must be put in proper context to be effective. Models or strategies have recently been developed and refined by evaluation theorists which aid in organizing and conducting evaluation and assessment efforts and providing contextual meaning for reporting and utilizing results. Comprehensive sets of both program and personnel evaluation standards have also been adopted nationally which should aid summer administrators in formulating and conducting evaluation studies.

Chapter 11 -- Endnotes

1. Robert J. Barak, Program Review in Higher Education: Within and Without, (Boulder, Colorado: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1982), ERIC, ED 246 829.

2. Carol M. Boyer, Peter T. Ewell, Joni E. Finey, and James R. Mingle, "Assessment and Outcomes Measurement: A View from the States," AAHE Bulletin 39(7) (March 1989):8-12.

3. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Outcomes Assessment Survey, (Washington, D.C.: Research and Program Development Division, NASPA, 1988).

4. Ibid., 1.

5. Samuel E. Morison, The Founding of Harvard College, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935), 256-59.

6. Lee J. Cronbach, Toward Reform of Program Evaluation (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980), 23-24.

7. Jack E. Rossman and Elaine El-Khawas, Thinking About Assessment: Perspectives for Presidents and Chief Academic Officers (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education and the American Association for Higher Education, June 1987), 4-5.

8. State Education Assessment Center, Council of Chief State School Officers, Accountability Reporting in the States: Report of a Survey--1987 (Washington, D.C.: The Council, 1988).

9. Education Commission of the States, State Activity: Minimum Compentency Testing (Denver: The Commission, 1985).

10. Carol M. Boyer, Peter T. Ewell, Joni E. Finey, and James R. Mingle, Assessment and Outcomes Measurement: A View from the States (Denver: Education Commission of the States, March 1987), 1-2.

11. Merlin C. Wittrock and David E. Wiley, The Evaluation of Instruction: Issues and Problems (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970).

12. Ibid., 28-32.

13. Scarvia B. Anderson, Samuel Ball, and Richard T. Murphy and Associates, The Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975), 26-29.

14. Pat Hutchings and Elaine Reuben, "Faculty Voices on Assessment," Change, 20(4) (July/August 1988):48-49.

15. Interview by William P. McDougall with Sharon Alexander, Director of Program Development and Summer Sessions, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C., 12 January 1989.

16. Clifton F. Conrad and Richard F. Wilson, Academic Program Reviews: Institutional Approaches, Expectations and Controversies, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education, Report No. 5 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1985), 13.

17. Ibid., 14.

18. Patricia Hutchings, Six Stories: Implementing Successful Assessment, AAHE Assessment Forum (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1987).

19. K. Patricia Cross, Feedback in the Classroom: Making Assessment Matter, AAHE Assessment Forum (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1987).

20. Ibid., 3.

21. National Governor's Association, "Task Force on College Quality" in National Governor's Association Report Time for Results: The Governor's 1991 Report on Education (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1986), 154.

22. Peter T. Ewell, Assessment, Accountability and Improvement: Managing the Contradiction, AAHE Assessment Forum (Washington, D.C.: American Associa tion for Higher Education, May 1987), 4-5.

23. Office of the Provost, Washington State University, "Principles and Procedures for Unit Education," Unpublished memorandum (Pullman: Washington State University, May 1986).

24. Robert O. Brinkerhoff, Dale M. Brethower, Terry Hluchyj, and Jeri Nowakowski, Program Evaluation: A Practitioners Guide for Trainers and Educators (Boston: Kluwer-Nyhoff Publishing, 1983), 17-18.

25. Ibid., 3.

26. Lee J. Cronbach and Associates, Toward Reform of Program Evaluation (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980), 340-352.

27. Gene V. Glass, The Growth of Evaluation Methodology, (Boulder, University of Colorado, Laboratory of Educational Research, 1972).

28. Ibid., 22.

29. Don E. Gardner, "Five Evaluation Frameworks: Implications for Decision Making in Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education, 8 (September/October 1977): 571-93.

30. Alexander W. Astin, Assessment and Human Values: Confessions of a Reformed Number-Cruncher, AAHE Assessment Forum (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, June 1988).

31. George F. Madaus, Michael Scriven and Daniel L. Stufflebean, Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services (Boston: Kluver-Nyhoff Publishing, 1989).

32. David G. Hawkridge, Peggy L. Campeaw, and Penelope K. Trickett, Preparing Evaluation Reports: A Guide for Authors. AIR Monograph 6 (Pittsburgh: American Institute for Research, 1970).

33. Denise M. Smith and Nick L. Smith, Writing Effective Evaluation Reports (Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, March 1980).

34. Blaine R. Worthen and Karl R. White, Evaluating Educational and Social Programs: Guidelines for Proposal Review, Evaluation Contracts, and Technical Assistance, Exhibit 9.4: Model Report (Kluwer . Nyhoff Pub. Co., Boston, 1987), 261-293.

35. Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Chair, Standards for Evaluations of Educational Programs, Projects and Materials (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981).

36. Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Chair, The Personnel Evaluation Standards (Newburg Park: Sage Publications, 1988.

REFERENCE LIST

Books

American Council on Higher Education. 1984-85 Fact Book on Higher Education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1984.

Anderson, Scarvia B., Samuel Ball, and Richard T. Murphy and Associates. The Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Brinkerhoff, Robert O., Dale M. Brithower, Terry Hluchyj, and Jeri R. Nowakowski. Program Evaluation: A Practitioners Guide for Trainers and Educators. Boston: Kluwer-Nyhoff Publishing, 1983.

Butts, R. Freeman and Lawrence A. Cremin. A History of Education in American Culture. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953.

Cronbach, Lee J. and Associates. Toward Reform and Program Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. Public Education in the United States. Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934.

Eckert, Ruth E. and John E. Stecklein. Job Motivations and Satisfactions of College Teachers: A Study of Faculty Members in Minnesota Colleges. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1961.

Eliot, Charles W. Educational Reform: Essays and Addresses. New York: The Century Company, 1898.

Glass, Gene V. The Growth of Evaluation Methodology. Boulder: Laboratory of Educational Research, University of Colorado, 1972.

Joint Committee on Standards of Educational Evaluation, Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Chair. Standards for Evaluations of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, Daniel L.Stufflebeam, Chair. The Personnel Evaluation Standards. Newburg Park: Sage Publications, 1988.

Knight, Edgar W. Twenty Centuries of Education. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1940.

Livesey, H. B. The Professors: Who They Are, What They Do, What They Really Want, and What They Need. New York: Charterhouse, 1975.

Madaus, George F., Michael Scriven, and Daniel L. Stufflebeam. Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services. Boston: Kluver-Nyhoff Publishing, 1989.

Martin, B. W. and A. J. Macdonell. Canadian Education: A Sociological Analysis. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice Hall of Canada Ltd., 1978.

Morison, Samuel E. The Founding of Harvard College. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.

Morison, Samuel E. Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Morison, Samuel E. Three Centuries of Harvard: 1636-1936. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Oleson, Loyd C. "Academic Calendars." In A. S. Knowles (Ed.). International Encyclopedia of Higher Education, Vol. 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Quann, C. James and Associates. Admissions, Academic Records, and Registrar Services. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1979.

Reeves, Floyd W., et al. The Liberal Arts College. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 19XX.

Russell, John D. and Charles H. Judd. The American Educational System.Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940.

Schoenfeld, Clarence A. and Neil Schmitz. Year-Round Education: Its Problems and Prospects from Kindergarten to College. Madison: Dembar Educational Research Services, Inc., 1964.

Schoenfeld, Clarence A. and Ronald N. Zillman. The American University in Summer. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Stickler, Hugh W. "The College Calendar: What Kind of a School Year?" In Samuel Baskin. Higher Education: Some New Developments. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

Vincent, John H. The Chautauqua Movement. Freeport, New York: The Chautauqua Press, 1886.

Wittrock, Merlin C. and David E. Wiley. The Evaluation of Instruction: Issues and Problems. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Worthen, Blaine R. and Karl R. White. Evaluating Educational and Social Programs: Guidelines for Proposal Review, Evaluation Contracts, and Technical Assistance (Exhibit 9.4: Model Report). Boston: Kluver . Nyhoff Pub. Co., 1987.

Journals and Magazines

"Alumni Colleges Increase Educational Activities." Times Educational Supplement, 7 March 1980, p. 5.

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Data Dispenser 5(4) (December 1985): 4.

Bloom, Arnold M. "In the Busy Old Summertime." American School and University 37 (July 1965): 9.

Bokelman, W. Robert and L. D'Amico. "A Comparison of 1959-60 Average Salaries of Selected Faculty Groups." College and University 36 (Spring 1961): 315.

Boyer, Carol M., Peter T. Ewell, Joni E. Finey, and James R. Mingle. "Assessment and Outcomes Measurement: A View from the States." AAHE Bulletin 39(7) (March 1989): 8-12.

Campbell, Calvin B. "Supportive Services Program for Students with Predicted Low Academic Abilities: A Coordinated Approach." Journal of College Student Personnel 22 (September 1981): 453-454.

Chepesiuk, Ron. "Elderhostel: An Education Program for the Times." The Elks Magazine 65 (September 1986): 4-5; 10; 37-38.

Chronicle of Higher Education 23 (February 10, 1982): 3.

Coash, John R. "Courses, Programs and Workshops for Earth Science Teachers." Journal of Geological Education 22 (May 1974): 116-119.

Coyner, Ruth E. "The South's First University Summer Normal School." Peabody Journal of Education 18 (September 1940): 173-182.

DeCou, Edgar E. "The Three-Term Versus the Two-Semester Plan in the Summer Session." School and Society 11 (February 28, 1920): 261-62.

Desmond, Richard L. "The Enigmatic Trimester Calendar." Educational Record 52 (Fall 1971): 371-376.

Evangelauf, Jean. "Half of All Faculty Members Taught in Summer and Earned an Average of $3,900, Survey Finds." The Chronicle of Higher Education 30(20) (17 July 1985): 23; 25.

Gardner, Don E. "Five Evaluation Frameworks: Implications for Decision Making in Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education 8 (September/October 1977): 571-93.

Glass, L. W. "A Cooperative University-High School Project for Talented Students." The Gifted Child Quarterly 23 (Fall 1979): 532-537.

Gwinn, Joseph M. "Tendencies in the Entrance Requirements of State Normal Schools." Education 28 (December 1907): 233-37.

Hall, Benny. "College Warm-Up: Casing the Transition to College." Journal of College Student Personnel 23 (May 1982): 280-281.

Harvey, William R. "Harvard, Yale, Columbia Intensive Summer Studies Program." Teachers College Record 73 (September 1971): 91-106.

Hefferlin, J. B. "Intensive Courses--An Old Idea Whose Time for Testing Has Come." Journal of Research and Development in Education 6(1) (Fall 1972): 83-98.

Hutchings, Pat and Elaine Rueben. "Faculty Voices on Assessment." Change 20(4) (July/August 1988): 48-49.

Hutchinson, Jerry E. and A. E. Johnson, Jr. "Summer Session Faculty Salaries." Research in Higher Education 20(3) (1984): 375-77.

Ingalls, Zoe. "We're Not Dead Yet." The Chronicle of Higher Education 20 (July 21, 1980): 3-4.

"Innovative Summer Program Continues at RP1." Virginia Journal of Education 61 (May 1968): 37.

Jacobson, Robert L. "Are the Days Dwindling Down for College Summer Sessions?" The Chronicle of Higher Education 15 (September 12, 1977): 3-4.

Justman, Joseph and Teitelbaum, Deena. "A Summer Session College Program for the Non-Elite." The Education Forum 29 (January 1965): 225-234.

Kanigel, Robert. "Alumni Colleges: No Vacation From Learning." Change 11(3) (April 1979): 21-24.

Kaplan, Max. "Elderhostel: Using a Lifetime of Learning and Experience." Change 13 (January/February 1981): 38-41.

Keller, Michael J. "Factors Influencing Students' Decision to Attend Summer School." College Student Journal 16(4) (Winter 1982): 348-352.

Kirk, Grayson. "College Shouldn't Take Four Years." The Saturday Evening Post, 26 March 1960, 111.

Kulich, Jindra. "The Summer School at Porec." Adult Leadership 19 (September 1970): 83-84.

Langway, Lynn and Dan Shapiro. "Learning Vacations." Newsweek, 21 August 1978, 47.

Magarrell, Jack. "Not All Summer Session Rolls Go Up With the Temperature." The Chronicle of Higher Education 22 (July 6, 1981): 5.

McKenna, David L. "The Academic Calendar in Transition." Educational Record 43 (January 1962): 68-75.

Meyer, Thomas J. "On Some Campuses, January is a Month for Students to Instruct Their Classmates." The Chronicle of Higher Education 20 (January 29, 1986): 21-22.

Montgomery, David C. "The Encouragement of Summer Enrollment." College and University 57 (Summer 1982): 353-364.

Notar, Ellen E. and Robin Deutsch. "Wisconsin College for Kids Stresses Active, Independent Learning." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 225-226.

Northby, Arwood S. "The Place of the Summer Session in the Collegiate Training of Undergraduate Students in Education." School and Society 43 (June 1936): 823-24.

Pittman, Robert M. "A Nontraditional Summer Program for the Urban University." Journal of College Student Personnel 23 (January 1982): 87-89.

Rice, Alexander H. "Why the Summer School?" Journal of Education 115 (May 1932): 353; 369.

Robustelli, Joseph A. and Walter R. Dirl. "Summer Youth Program." Educational Horizons 56 (Spring 1978): 130-136.

Rudensky, Maria. "Early Semester Calendars Found Most Popular." The Chronicle of Higher Education 23 (February 17, 1982): 3.

Sandefur, J. T. "Competency Assessment of Teachers." Action in Teacher Education 7 (Spring/Summer 1985): 1-36.

Sawyer, Robert N. "The Duke University Educational Programs for Brilliant Youths." Roeper Review 7 (November 1984): 103-109.

Schoenfeld, Clarence A. "The Summer Session Comes of Age." School and Society 89 (Summer 1961): 268-70.

"State Universities Expand Summer Plans." Wisconsin Journal of Education 101 (March 1969): 13.

Stecklein, John E., Mary Corcoran, and E. W. Ziebarth. "The University Summer Session: An Appendage or Part of the Whole?" College and University 35 (Spring 1960): 307-316.

"Summer Session/70 at Wisconsin State Universities." Wisconsin Journal of Education 102(7) (March 1970): 5-12.

Venmon, William C. "'Swing Shift' Freshmen at the University of Massachusetts." College and University 41 (Winter 1966): 217-220.

Watkins, Beverly T. "Renaissance at Chautauqua." The Chronicle of Higher Education 23 (September 23, 1981): 4-5.

"What's Happening to Summer School?" College Management 4 (January 1969): 9-15.

Young, Raymond J. "Factors Associated with Creativity: Educational Programming for Summer Terms." Continuing Higher Education Review 53(1) (Winter 1989): 27-34.

Government Publications

National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics, 1981-82. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1981.

National Center for Education Statistics. 3,270 Postsecondary Institutions Accredited in 1980-81. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1981.

National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics, 1983-84. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983.

National Center for Education Statistics. The Condition of Education, 1984. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1984.

National Center for Education Statistics. Projections of Education Statistics to 1992-93. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985.

National Center for Education Statistics. The Condition of Education, 1985. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985.

National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics, 1989. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1989.

U.S. Bureau of Education. "Teachers Institutes," by James H. Smart. Circulars of Information of the Bureau of Education, Circular No. 2, 1885. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1885.

U.S. Bureau of Education. History of Higher Education in Massachusetts, by George G. Bush. Circular of Information No. 6, 1891 (Contributions to American Educational History No. 13). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1891.

U.S. Bureau of Education. Rise and Growth of the Normal-School Idea in the United States, by J. P. Gordy. Circular of Information No. 8, 1891. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1891.

U.S. Bureau of Education. "Chautauqua," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1891-1892, Volume 1, Chapter 29. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1894.

U.S. Bureau of Education. "The History of Summer Schools in the United States," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1891-1892, by W. W. Willoughby, Volume 2, Chapter 29. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1894.

U.S. Bureau of Education. "Chautauqua: A Social and Educational Study," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1894-1895, Volume 1, Chapter 19. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1896.

U.S. Bureau of Education. "A Checklist of American Summer Schools," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1894-1895, Volume II, Chapter 36. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1896.

U.S. Bureau of Education. "Educational Extension in the United States," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900, by Herbert B. Adams, Volume I, Chapter 5, Sections 3, 5, and 6. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.

U.S. Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900, Volume II, Chapter 38. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.

U.S. Bureau of Education. Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year Ending June 30, 1904, Volume II, Chapter 38. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1905.

U.S. Bureau of Education. The Teaching Staff of Secondary Schools in the United States, by Edward L. Thorndike, Bulletin No. 4. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1909.

U.S. Bureau of Education. Statistics of State Universities and Other Institutions of Higher Education Partially Supported by the State, Bulletin No. 8, 1908. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1909.

U.S. Bureau of Education. Teachers Certificates Issued Under General State Laws and Regulations, by Harlan Updegraff, Bulletin No. 18. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1911.

U.S. Bureau of Education. "Teachers Institutes," Agencies for the Improvement of Teachers in Service, by William C. Ruediger, Bulletin No. 3, 1911. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1911.

U.S. Bureau of Education. Public and Private High Schools, Bulletin No. 22, 1912. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1912.

U.S. Bureau of Education. Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year Ended June 30, 1911, Volume 2, Chapter 30. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1912.

U.S. Bureau of Education. The Status of Rural Education in the United States, by A. C. Monahan, Bulletin No. 8. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1913.

U.S. Bureau of Education. Economy of Time in Education, by George Baker, Bulletin No. 38, 1913. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1913.

U.S. Bureau of Education. Statistics of State Universities and Other Institutions of Higher Education Partially Supported by the State, Bulletin No. 60, 1913. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1914.

U.S. Bureau of Education. Statistics of State Universities and State Colleges, Bulletin No. 55, 1917. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918.

U.S. Bureau of Education. Biennial Survey of Education 1916-18, Volume IV, Chapter 5, Bulletin No. 91, 1919. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921.

U.S. Bureau of Education. State Laws and Regulations Governing Teachers' Certificates, by Katherine Cook, Bulletin No. 22. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921.

U.S. Bureau of Education. University Summer Schools, by James C. Egbert, Bulletin No. 31, 1922. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1922.

U.S. Bureau of Education. Statistics of State Universities and State Colleges, Bulletin No. 53, 1921. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1922.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970, Part 1. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1986.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Center for Education Statistics, Instructional Faculty Salaries for Academic Year 1984-85. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1986.

U.S. Division of Education. Salaries and Tenure of Institutional Faculty in Institutions in the U.S. in 1974-75, by R. M. Beazley. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, Division of Education, 1975.

U.S. Department of Education. "State Normal Schools," Report of the Commissioner of Education, by Henry Barnard (Special Circular No. 10, 1867). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1868.

U.S. Office of Education. Survey of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, Bulletin No. 9, Volume II. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1930.

U.S. Office of Education, "Professional Education of Teachers," Biennial Survey of Education 1928-1930, by Benjamin W. Frazier, Bulletin No. 20, 1931. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932.

U.S. Office of Education. Educational Directory 1932, Bulletin No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932.

U.S. Office of Education. Summer Educational Opportunities: Novel Features of University and College Summer Sessions, by Ella B. Ratcliffe, Pamphlet No. 27. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932.

U.S. Office of Education. "Summer Sessions" (Unpublished Survey of Summer Schools in the Files). In Frank K. Foster, "Summer Sessions for Teachers," National Survey of Education of Teachers, Volume III. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933.

U.S. Office of Education. National Survey of the Education of Teachers, by Benjamin W. Frazier, et al., Bulletin 1933, No. 10, Volume V, Chapters 2, 3, 4. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935.

U.S. Office of Education. National Survey of the Education of Teachers, by E.S. Evenden, Bulletin 1933, No. 10, Volume VI. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935.

U.S. Office of Education. Statistics of Higher Education, 1931-32 (Biennial Survey of Education in the United States: 1930-1932, Bulletin No. 2, 1933, Chapter 3). Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1935.

U.S. Office of Education. Statistics of Higher Education, 1933-34 (Biennial Survey of Education in the United States: 1932-34, Bulletin No. 2, 1935, Chapter 4). Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1937.

U.S. Office of Education. Statistical Summary of Education 1935-36 (Biennial Survey of Education in the United States: 1934-36, Volume II, Bulletin No. 2, 1937, Chapter 1). Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1939.

U.S. Office of Education. Statistics of Higher Education 1937-38 (Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, Volume II, Bulletin No. 2, 1940, Chapter 4). Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1941.

U.S. Office of Education. Education of Teachers as a Function of State Departments of Education, by Benjamin W. Frazier, Bulletin No. 6, Monograph No. 6, 1940. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941.

U.S. Office of Education. Statistical Summary of Education, 1937-38 (Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, Volume II, Bulletin No. 2, 1940, Chapter 1). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941.

U.S. Office of Education. Supervision of Instruction as a Function of State Departments of Education, by Katherine M. Cook, Bulletin 1940, No. 6, Monograph No. 7, 1941. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941.

U.S. Office of Education. Statistical Summary of Education 1948-50 (Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1948-50, Chapter 1). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1953.

U.S. Office of Education. Biennial Survey of Education, Statistics of Higher Education 1955-56. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1955.

U.S. Office of Education. Biennial Survey of Education, Statistics of Higher Education 1955-56. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956.

U.S. Office of Education. Participation in Adult Education, Circular No. 539, 1959. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959.

U.S. Office of Education. Statistics of Rural Schools: A U. S. Summary, Circular No. 565, 1959. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959.

U.S. Office of Education. Statistics of Higher Education, 1955-56 (Biennial Survey of Education in the United States--1954-56, Chapter 1, Section 1). Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1959.

U.S. Office of Education. Summer Session Offerings in Institutions of Higher Education, 1960: A Directory. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962.

U.S. Office of Education. Summer Sessions in Colleges and Universities in the United States 1960, by Warner, Donald F., Bernice R. Retzlaff, and Harold A. Haswell, Circular No. 700. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

U.S. Office of Education. Teachers Negotiate with Their School Boards, by James P. Steffenson, Bulletin No. 40, 1964. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.

U.S. Office of Education. Accelerated Programs in Degree-Granting Colleges and Universities, by Winston, Ellen and Maude Farr. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, n.d.

Educational Association/Organization Publications

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Educating a Profession: Extended Programs for Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1983.

American Association of Teachers Colleges, A. Linscheid, Ed., Yearbook of the American Association of Teachers Colleges. New York: The Association, 1928.

Association of Deans and Directors of Summer Sessions. Proceedings: Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Association of Deans and Directors of Summer Sessions (NP: The Association, 1940). In Russell A. May. "A History of the Association of University Summer Sessions," Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1971.

Association of Deans and Directors of Summer Sessions, "Minutes of the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Association of Deans and Directors of Summer Sessions," 1932, 52. In Russell A. May, "A History of the Association of University Summer Sessions," Ed.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1971.

Astin, Alexander W. Assessment and Human Values: Confessions of a Human Number-Cruncher (AAHE Assessment Forum). Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, June 1988.

Committee of the Association of University Summer Session Deans and Directors. Year-round Operation in American Universities. Boulder, Colorado: The Association, 1963.

Committee on the University Calendar of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. The University Calendar. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1961.

Conrad, Clifton F. and Richard F. Wilson. Academic Program Reviews: Institutional Approaches, Expectations and Controversies, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1985.

Cross, Patricia K. Feedback in the Classroom: Making Assessment Matter (AAHE Assessment Forum). Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, June 1987.

Deal, Willard M. Jr. "Major Problems of Summer Session Administration," Study conducted for the Research Committee of the North American Association of Summer Sessions, June 1977 (Unpublished).

Education Commission of the States. State Activity: Minimum Competency Testing. Denver: The Commission, 1985.

Ewell, Peter T. Assessment, Accountability and Improvement: Managing the Contradiction (AAHE Assessment Forum). Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, May 1987.

Grosman, Erica, ed. Quality in Teacher Education: A Crisis Revisited. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1985.

Gustad, J. N. The Career Decisions of College Teachers. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1960.

Henderson, Algo D. "A Critical Look at Year-Round Operations of Institutions." Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, 1962.

Hooten, David E. Career Patterns and Competency Needs of Summer Session Administrators. North American Association of Summer Sessions, October 1974.

Hutchings, Patricia. Six Stories: Implementing Successful Assessment (AAHE Assessment Forum). Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, June 1987.

McDonnell, Lorraine M. "NEA Priorities and Their Impact on Teacher Education." AACTE Yearbook 1977. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1977.

Marts, Marion. "Minutes of the 1977 Annual Meeting" 14 November 1977. Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Outcomes Assessment Survey. Washington, D.C.: Research and Program Development Division, NASPA, 1988.

National Governor's Association. "Task Force on College Quality" in National Governor's Association Report Time for Results: The Governor's 1991 Report on Education. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1986.

Nelson, Michael U. "A Survey of Summer Session Administration: A Sample of 186 Four-Year Colleges" (Research Report for the Association of University Summer Sessions). St. Louis: Association of University Summer Sessions, 1972.

Nelson, Michael U. "A Survey of Summer Session Administration: A Sample of 189 Universities" (Research Report for the Association of University Summer Sessions). St. Louis: Association of University Summer Sessions, 1972.

National Advisory Council on Adult Education. Opening Doors for Success, FY-1983 Annual Report to the President of the United States. Washington, D.C.: The Council, 1984.

North American Association of Summer Sessions, "Summer Sessions Bibliography" (mimeographed and undated).

Notes for Meeting of American Summer Session Senate on "Our Man in Washington" 11 November 1975. Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

"Review of Second National Institute in Summer Term Administration, Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State University, 5-8 January 1975" (Undated and mimeographed). Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Rossman, Jack E. and Elaine El-Khawas. Thinking About Assessment: Perspectives for Presidents and Chief Academic Officers. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education and the American Association for Higher Education, 1987.

Schoenfeld, Clarence A. "Committee Reports" (Memo to Senate Members) 17 May 1976. Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Schoenfeld, Clarence A. "Record of Meeting, Tuesday 11 November 1975, Carefree, Arizona" (Memo to Senate Members), 13 November 1975. Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Schoenfeld, Clarence A. "Summary of Responses" (Typed and Undated Results of a Survey of Past Presidents of Summer Session Associations). Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Smith, Clodus R. Higher Education in the Summer: A Comparison of Thirty-Two Summer Sessions. College Park, Maryland: National Association of Summer Sessions Research Committee, Office of Summer Programs, University of Maryland, 1972.

Smith, Denise M. and Nick L. Smith. Writing Effective Evaluation Reports. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Laboratory, 1980.

State Education Assessment Center, Council of Chief State School Officers. Accountability Reporting in the States: Report of a Survey--1987. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1988.

Warn, Jill. "Review of General Session Topics Since 1970 for Annual Conferences of WASSA" (Unpublished Paper Prepared for a Western Association of Summer Session Administrators' Conference). Office of Summer Sessions, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.

Watkins, Lloyd I. "A President's Expectation of the Summer Session," In Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual Conference of the North American Association of Summer Sessions. St. Louis: The Association, 1986.

Western Association of Summer Session Administrators. "Business Meeting Minutes of the 1966 Annual Conference, Portland, Oregon 4 November 1966." Office of Summer Sessions, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.

Young, Raymond J. and William P. McDougall. Recent Changes in Summer Sessions of U.S. and Canadian Colleges and Universities. St. Louis, MO: North American Association of Summer Sessions, 1985.

University Office Publications

Abraham, Nancy. 1977 Summer Sessions Associations' Second Joint Statistical Report. Alfred, New York: Alfred University Office of Summer Sessions, 1977.

"Agenda for American Summer Sessions Senate Executive Committee Meeting 23-24 March 1978." Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Applbaum, Ronald L. "Summer Session Report: Summary and Analysis." Edinburg, Texas: Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs, Pan American University (mimeographed and undated).

Berger, Carl, "The Holmes Group Meets at Wingspread," The University of Michigan School of Education Innovater, 18 (September 1986): 2.

Brook, Paula, Don Chapman, and Peter Wright. Summer Session Learning Experiences at the University of Alberta (A Report for the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators). Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: Adult, Career and Technology Education Faculty, University of Alberta, 1989.

Butler, Lewis. 1984 Summer Sessions Associations Joint Statistical Report. Alfred, New York: Alfred University, 1984.

Butler, Lewis. 1986 Summer Sessions Association Joint Statistical Report. Alfred, New York: Alfred University, 1986.

Cowley, William H. A Study of the Relative Merits of the Quarter and Semester Systems (Report of Faculty Committee Approved by Faculty and Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University). Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1932.

Dwyer, Paul S. Report of the University of Calendar Study Committee. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, June 1958.

Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs. Summer Session Annual Reports 1982-1986. Madison: The Division, University of Wisconsin, 1986.

Easton, Elmer C. Year-Round Operation of Colleges (Engineering Research Bulletin No. 41). New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University, 1958.

George, Richard J. "Summer Sessions Survey" (Unpublished manuscript). Department of Business Administration, Saint Joseph's College, April 1975.

Himes, Ellvert H. WASSA: A History. Logan, Utah: Office of Summer Sessions, Utah State University, 1973.

Kramer, J. Howard. "Facts and Functions: A Brief History of the North Central Conference on Summer Schools" (mimeographed, 1962). Office of Summer Sessions, South Dakota State University, Aberdeen, South Dakota.

Little, John R. "The Development of the Western Association of Summer School Administrators" (Unpublished mimeographed paper prepared in 1965 and revised January 1966). Boulder, Colorado: Office of Summer Sessions, University of Colorado.

McGill, E. C. "A Study of Summer Session Programs in State Supported Colleges and Universities Which Are Members of the North American Association of Summer Schools" (unpublished manuscript). Office of Summer Sessions, Southern Oregon State College, November 1979.

Office of Institutional Research. Summer Session I and II Budget Enrollment Reports 1982-1986. Raleigh: The Office, North Carolina State University, 1986.

Office of the Registrar. University of Wisconsin-Madison Enrollment Reports for Summer Sessions, 1982-1986. Madison: The Office, University of Wisconsin, 1986.

Office of Summer Session. Continuity of Registration Reports 1982-1986. St. Paul: University of Minnesota, 1986.

Office of Summer Session. Enrollment Reports, 1985 and 1986. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1986.

Office of Summer Session. 1986 Summer Session Planning Guide. Pullman: Washington State University, 1986.

Office of Summer Session. 1987 Summer Session Planning Guide. Pullman: Washington State University, 1987.

Office of the Provost, Washington State University. "Principles and Procedures for Unit Evaluation" (Unpublished memorandum). Pullman: Washington State University, May 1986.

Samson, Harland E., et al. Assessment of Summer Sessions Curricular Needs. Madison: Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, 1982.

Schoenfeld, Clarence A., et al. A Bibliography of Summer Sessions Literature in Higher Education. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison Summer Sessions Office, April 1978.

Solberg, Jeanne and Darwin D. Heridel. An Evaluation of the 1980 Summer Session. St. Paul: Measurement Services Center, University of Minnesota, 1981.

Summer Sessions Associations' Joint Statistical Reports, 1979-1984. Alfred, New York: Alfred University Office of Summer Sessions, 1984.

Taylor, Alton L. and Frank Papovich. Biennial Evaluation and Planning Report. Charlottesville: Office of the Summer Session, University of Virginia, 1986.

Thompson, Ronald B. "A Survey of the Nature of the Administrative Organization of Summer Schools." Columbus: Ohio State University, February 1973 (mimeographed).

Warren, Helen. "Administrative Roles: Challenge and Change Survey Results" (a study conducted for the North American Association of Summer Sessions). University Park, Pennsylvania: Office of Summer Session, undated.

ERIC Documents

American Institute for Research in Behavioral Sciences. College Bound Program, New York, N.Y. Model Programs, Compensatory Education Series. Palo Alto: The Institute, 1972. ERIC, ED 068 620.

American Institute for Research in Behavioral Sciences. College Bound Program, New York City: Secondary Program in Compensatory Education 4. Palo Alto: The Institute, 1969. ERIC, ED 027 367.

Association of Teachers of Latin American Studies. Newsletter. Brooklyn: The Association, 1973. ERIC, ED 087 649.

Axford, Roger W. The Teacher Aide . . . An Answer to the Teacher Shortage. Augusta: Maine State Department of Education, 1968. ERIC, ED 043 811.

Barak, Robert J. Program Review in Higher Education: Within and Without. Boulder, Colorado: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1982. ERIC, ED 246 829.

Bell, A. P. Institute on Critical Issues in Vocational and Technical Teacher Education in Small Colleges and Universities (Center Seminar and Conference Report No. 8). Raleigh: University of North Carolina, 1967. ERIC, ED 020 425.

Berquist, William H., et al. The College I Experience: Integrating Work, Leisure, and Service. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1980. ERIC, ED 184 387.

Canadian Association of Departments of Extension and Summer Schools. Directory of Personnel. Ottawa: The Association, 1968 ERIC ED 016 923 and ED 026 575; 1969 ERIC 035 808.

Douglas, Joel M., Loren A. Krause, and Leonard Winogora. Workload and Productivity Bargaining in Higher Education, Monograph No. 3. New York: Bernard Baruch College, City University of New York, 1980. ERIC, ED 196 346.

Douglas, Peggy, et al. Developing Pre-College Programs for High Ability Secondary Students at the University Level (Revision of a Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association). Tucson, Arizona, November 1983. ERIC, ED 254 141.

EDPA Summer Institute for Home Economics--Gainful Teachers of the Disadvantaged, Final Report. Orangeburg: South Carolina State College, 1971. ERIC, ED 059 167.

Farrow, Earl V. Special Programs at Livingston College: Assessment I, 1977-80. New Brunswick: Rutgers University, 1980. ERIC, ED 213 360.

Fiori, Clem and Earl P. Thomas. An Outline of the Goals, Objectives, and Activities of the Princeton Cooperative School Program. Princeton: Princeton University, 1976. ERIC, ED 144 430.

Garber, John C. An Independent Evaluation of the 1962 Summer Institute Program of the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board, With Recommendations for Future Institutes. Iowa City: University of Iowa, 1963. ERIC, ED 003 424.

Georgia Board of Regents. University System of Georgia Annual Report for Fiscal Year July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977. Atlanta: The Regents, 1977. ERIC, ED 156 040.

Goeres, Ernest R. Compensation for Overload and Extra Contractial Services, Collective Bargaining Perspectives. Morgantown, West Virginia: West Virginia University, 1977. ERIC, ED 140 711.

Gomez, Anna N. and Anthony J. Vasquez. The Needs of the Chicano on the College Campus. Long Beach: California State College, 1969. ERIC, ED 031 323.

Haehn, James O. and Ralph F. Meuter. Student and Faculty Responses to an Experiment in Inter-Institutional Cooperation (Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the California Educational Research Association, November 7, 1974). San Francisco: The Association, 1974. ERIC, ED 097 070.

Havice, Doris W. Report on the Summer Institute on the Teaching of Humanities at Miles College in 1969. Birmingham: Miles College, 1970. ERIC, ED 068 011.

Hixson, Bruce, ed. General College Programs and Projects Receiving Outside Financial Support. Minneapolis: General College, University of Minnesota, 1982. ERIC, ED 220 007.

Hoenigswald, Henry M., et al. A Survey of Intensive Programs in the Uncommon Languages, Summer 1962. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1962. ERIC, ED 016 209.

Hontz, Glenn. Special Training Institute on Problems of School Desegregation. New Orleans: Tulane University, 1967. ERIC, ED 027 242.

Houston, Peggy. Iowa Elderhostel. Iowa City: The University of Iowa, 1980. ERIC, ED 194 766.

Institute for Services in Education. Journey Into Discovery. The Thirteen-College Curriculum Program. Washington, D.C.: The Institute, 1969. ERIC, ED 097 844.

Kadunc, Nancy J. and Gary E. Thompson. Evaluating Summer Tech '83: A Program to Meet the Microcomputer Needs of the Community (Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association). New Orleans, April 1984. ERIC, ED 244 596.

Kane, Pearl R. A Teacher Institute for Beginning Teachers (Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association). New Orleans, April 1984. ERIC, ED 242 696.

King, Charles L. Evaluations of the Summer 1962 Language Institutes. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1963. ERIC, ED 038 052.

Linguistic Society of America. Guide to Programs in Linguistics: 1974-75. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, Linguistic Society of America, 1975. ERIC, ED 107 131.

Longaker, Richard R. and Robert Cleary. Report on Evaluation of Pilot Civics Institutes, NDEA, 1966. Los Angeles: University of California, 1966. ERIC, ED 012 272.

Mares, Kenneth, et al. Description and Evaluation of the 1980 Summer Scholars Program. Columbia, MO: The University of Missouri, 1980. ERIC, ED 201 259.

Martinez, Luciano. University of Utah Summer Health Science Program 1977. Salt Lake City: Ethnic Minority Student Health Science Center, University of Utah, 1977. ERIC, ED 149 946.

Mental Health Research and Development Center, Institute for Urban Affairs and Research. Faculty Research Development Workshop. Washington, D.C.: Howard University, 1982. ERIC, ED 244 596.

Mueller, Theodore H. and Henri Niedzielski. Programming Instruction in Teacher Retraining, NDEA Institutes. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1966. ERIC, ED 025 174.

Mulhern, John D. and Robert C. Morris. A Field Practicum for Teachers of Gifted Children: The South Carolina Experience. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1982. ERIC, ED 213 661.

Nash, George and Julian H. Nixon. Respond to Challenge: The New York City Urban Corps. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1967. ERIC, ED 031 135.

National Science Foundation. Summer Institutes for Secondary Teachers of Science, Mathematics and Social Science. Washington, D.C.: The Foundation, 1972. ERIC, ED 059 155.

Palomba, Neil A. and Edward B. Jakubauskas. Manpower Research in the 1970s. Washington, D.C.: Manpower Administration, Department of Labor, 1971. ERIC, ED 069 910.

Pearce, Theodore. Summer Institutes on Fluid Power Education for Vocational and Technical Teachers. Thiensville, Wisconsin: Fluid Power Society, 1967. ERIC, ED 016 113.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. Higher Education Summer and Fall Enrollments, 1983. Harrisburg: The Department, 1983. ERIC, ED 262 709.

Powell, James H., Nick Ghassomians, and Catherine Lytle. Interim Report of the Institute for Supervisors of Student Teachers on Problems Occasioned by Desegration of Public Schools, July 6 Through August 12, 1965. Lexington: College of Education, University of Kentucky, 1965. ERIC, ED 045 742.

Rehnke, Mary A. Programming for Summer Sessions in the 1980s (Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the North American Association of Summer Sessions Conference). Las Vegas, November 1979. ERIC, ED 181 827.

Saquel-Montalva, Mario. Final Report on the EDPA Institute for Advanced Study for Secondary School Native Spanish Teachers of Spanish, June 23, 1969 to August 8, 1969. Dayton: University of Dayton, 1969. ERIC, ED 038 059.

Schultheis, Robert A. and Alvin Vaughn. Changing Undergraduate Business Teacher Education Programs to Prepare Teachers for Culturally Different Youth. Columbus: Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, 1968. ERIC, ED 024 837.

Seagren, Alan T. and Ruth E. Randall. Thirty Years of Sharing, Summer Sessions Commitment to Students, Innovations and Quality, North Central Conference on Summer Schools, 1949-1978. Rockford, Illinois: North Central Conference on Summer Schools, 1979. ERIC, ED 181 813.

Spaulding, Ben and Tony Mason. College Opportunities for Southern Negro Students, 2nd Ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1966. ERIC, ED 022 819.

State University of New York, Office of Institutional Research. Non-Credit Instructional Activities, January 1, 1985 Through June 30, 1985, With Trend Information for 1983, 1984, and 1985 (Report Number 20-85A). ERIC, ED 265 768.

Steward, Blair B., et al. Experimental Refining and Strengthening of Undergraduate Foreign Language Curricula with Supporting Research in Teaching Techniques. Chicago: Associated Colleges of the Midwest, 1964. ERIC, ED 003 880.

Tracey, T. J., W. E. Sedlacek, and A. M. Patterson, Jr. Perceptions of Summer School Faculty at a Large University, Counseling Center Research Report No. 7-80. College Park, Maryland: Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, 1980. ERIC, ED 208 740.

Wilkerson, Doxey A. Compensatory Practices in Colleges and Universities, Bulletin No. 2(2) March 1966. New York: Yeshiva University, 1966. ERIC, ED 011 908.

Willson, Robert. A College-Level Art Curriculum in Glass. Coral Gables: Miami University, 1968. ERIC, ED 023 355.

Young, Raymond J. and William P. McDougall. Relationships of Selected Factors to Summer Session Organizational Structure. Calgary: University of Calgary Faculty of Continuing Education, Fall 1982. ERIC, ED 235 734.

Doctoral Dissertations

Angell, Charles E., "A Study of the Origin and Development of the 4-1-4 Undergraduate College Program with Special Considerations for the Interim Term" (Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1969).

Avent, Joseph H., "The Summer Sessions in State Teachers Colleges as a Factor in the Professional Education of Teachers" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1925).

Belle, Robert L., "The Summer Sessions Rationale in the School of Education, The University of Wisconsin-Madison" (Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1972).

Courter, John F., "An Analysis of Selected Aspects of the Syracuse University Summer Sessions" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Syracuse University, 1963).

Coyne, Leslie J., "An Analysis of Jointly Administered Summer Sessions and Continuing Education in Institutions of Higher Education" (Ed.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1978).

Cundiff, Edward W., "The University Summer Session" (Ed.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1952).

Dickerman, Watson B., "The Historical Development of the Summer Session in Higher Institutions in the United States" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1945).

Fallon, Jerome A., "The Influence of the Summer School on the State of Michigan, 1874-1931 with Special Reference to the University of Michigan" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1959).

Heidenreich, Charles A., "A Study of the Functions and Powers of Summer Session Directors in Selected Institutions of Higher Education in the United States" (Ed.D. Dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1965).

Judd, Cornelius D., The Summer School as an Agency for the Training of Teachers in the United States. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, Contributions to Education No. 3, 1921.

MaCleay, William B. III, "An Analysis of the Impact of the Colorado State College Summer Program for Competency, 1963-1965 (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1974).

McCandless, Charles E., "An Evaluation of a Guidance-Structured Summer Session for Entering University Freshmen" (Ed.D. Dissertation, North Texas State University, 1965).

McNeil, Mellicent, A Comparative Study of Entrance to Teacher-Training Institutions (Ph.D. Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions to Education No. 443, 1930).

May, Russell, "A History of the Association of University Summer Sessions: Fifty Years of Progress" (Ed.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1970).

Miller, John E., "Factors Associated with Summer Sessions in Selected United States Liberal Arts Colleges" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington State University, 1989).

Ritchie, Linda D., "History of the University of Nebraska Summer Sessions: 1891-1915" (Ed.D. Dissertation, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1980).

Selsky, Joel M., "An Evaluative Study of the University of South Alabama's First Upward Bound Summer Program" (Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Houston, 1974).

Shrader, Edward F., "A Descriptive Study of Students in the Pre-College Summer Session Program" (Ed.D. Dissertation, The University of Maryland, 1965).

Slate, Joe H., "A Study of Students Not Meeting Admissions Requirements and a Summer Program to Preface Them for Admission" (Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Alabama, 1970).

Correspondence

Goodnight, S. H. to Edward H. Kraus 3 October 1917. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Goodnight, S. H., George P. Bristol, and Edward H. Kraus (Circular letter). Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Kraus, Edward H. to S. H. Goodnight and George P. Bristol, 28 September 1917. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Kraus, Edward H. and George Bristol 11 October 1917. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917. University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Kraus, Edward H. to H. B. Hutchins, President, The University of Michigan 11 October 1917. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Kraus, Edward H., George P. Bristol, and S. H. Goodnight to President Harry Pratt Judson 26 October 1917. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Kraus, Edward H. to S. H. Goodnight 29 October 1917. Bentley Historical 7 Library, University of Michigan Summer Sessions Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Kraus, Edward H. and J. E. Lough to F. J. Kelly 30 October 1919. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1919, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Kraus, Edward H. to Rollin D. Salisbury 19 November 1917. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Kraus, Edward H. to J. L. McConaughy 30 November 1917. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Sessions Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917, University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Nelson, Mike to Raymond J. Young 12 December 1986. Office of Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.

Marts, Marion to Denis Kigin and Nancy Abraham 14 November 1977. Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Schoenfeld, Clarence A. to Robert Richey, Charles Noyes, Denis Kigin, and Curt Moore 6 December 1972. Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Schoenfeld, Clarence A. to American Association for Higher Education 21 November 1975. Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Schoenfeld, Clarence A. to Paul Hadley 29 December 1977. Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Warn, Jill to William P. McDougall 15 February 1987. Office of Summer Sessions, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.

Newspapers

Michigan Daily, 21, 22, and 25 November 1917. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan Summer Session Archives Correspondence Folder July-December 1917. University of Michigan North Campus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

New York Times. 16 January 1964; 88.

Monographs

Hawkridge, D. G., P. L. Campeaw, and P. K. Trickett. Preparing Evaluation Reports: A Guide for Authors, AIR Monograph No. 6. Pittsburgh: American Institute for Research, 1970.

Pressy, Sidney L. Educational Acceleration, Appraisals and Basic Problems (Bureau of Educational Research Monograph No. 31). Columbus: Ohio State University, 1949.

Young, Raymond J. Summer Sessions in Public Two-Year Colleges (Monograph Series). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1989.

Miscellaneous

Alexander, Sharon, Director of Program Development and Summer Sessions, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C. Interview by William P. McDougall 12 January 1989.

Arbeiter, Soloman, "Guns, Butter, or Sheepskins," The College Board Review, No. 137, 1985.

Little, John R. "Year-Round Operation in American Universities." Paper presented at the North Central Conference of Summer Schools, Chicago, Illinois, March 1963.

Seagren, Alan T., Soloman, Keith J. and McNulty, Lynda J., "Strategies for the Internal Development of Summer Sessions." Paper presented at the North American Summer Sessions Conference of Charlotte, North Carolina, November 1980.

APPENDIX A

FRENCH LANGUAGE DIPLOMA PROGRAM EVALUATION:

A DRAFT PROPOSAL

Rationale

For the past fifteen years, the Division of University Extension and Community Relations has offered a Diploma Program in French language. The five-level program has been based on the curriculum which utilizes an audio-visual approach for the first three levels and an eclectic materials approach for levels four and five. Since its inception, the program has not been evaluated. Because of the shift of the Language Lab from a behaviorist model to a more student centered focus and due to a sharp decline in enrollment for the French Language Diploma Program (FLDP), it is being recommended that the program be evaluated. The results of the evaluation will be used to either enhance the existing program or to provide a foundation for change, if one is warranted. The primary investigator in the study would be Dr. Sharon E. Alexander, Division of University Extension and Community Relations, with stakeholder assistance from Lucie Daigle, Teaching Supervisor of the Program.

Questions

In initiating the investigation, the following questions are being proposed to be addressed in the study.

1. How effective is the FLDP?
2. What are the goals of the FLDP and to what extent are they being met from the students' perspective and the institution's perspective?
3. To what extent does the existing curriculum and the delivery methodology meet the changing needs of the students, the community and institution?
4. What curricula do other universities across Canada utilize in the delivery of French Language Diploma programs?

Design of Study

A multi-method program evaluation is proposed which utilizes both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection. The investigation will utilize questionnaires, interviews, and focus-group interviews. The data will be collated, synthesized, and analyzed using the major questions in the studyas organizers. Table 14 displays a grid which identifies the stakeholders in the study and the methods of data collection on a per-question basis.

The stakeholder groups include the following:

1. Students: Those persons currently registered, Levels I-V in the FLDP.
2. Graduates: Those individuals who have received diplomas upon successful completion of the FLDP.
3. Former Students: Those individuals who are not currently enrolled in the program, but who have completed Level One (or more) but who have opted not to continue study.
4. Instructors: Persons teaching full-time or part-time in the FLDP over the past five years.
5. Line Administration: Lucie Daigle, Chris Gambrell, Wendy Fischer.
6. Academic Administration: Gordon Thompson, Larry Devlin, Sharon Alexander, French Language Program Committee Chair, John Greene.

Table 15 displays the time-frame for the development and implementation of the proposed evaluation.

Budget

The budget for the proposed evaluation project is outlined below. While it is assumed that the major investigator, Dr. Sharon E. Alexander, in cooperation with Lucie Daigle, will be conducting the study as part of load, certain other expenses will be incurred, as follows:

Line Item	Amount
Academic Assistance	$1,500.00
Postage	100.00
Printing	200.00
Computer (Data Entry/Analysis)	200.00
	$2,000.00

In conclusion, this proposal is being submitted to provide information which should assist short and long range decision making in regards to the program and modification of same.

TABLE 14

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

Questions	Current Students	Grads	Former Students	Community	Instructors	Curric. Hard/Soft Ware	Line Admin.	Academic Administration
How effective is the FLDP?	Questionnaire Interviews	Questionnaire Interviews	Questionnaire Interviews	Random Interviews	Focus Group Interviews	Expert Assessment	Open-Ended Interviews	Open/Closed Interviews
What are the goals to FLDP and to what extent are they being met from the student's perspective and from institutional perspective?	Focus Group Interviews					Focus Group Interviews		Focus Group Interviews
To what extent does existing curriculum and delivery methodology meet the changing needs of student community and institution?								
What curricula do other universities across Canada utilize in the delivery of French Language Diploma programs?				Questionnaire				

TABLE 15

TIME-FRAME FOR COMPLETION OF F.L.D.P. PROGRAM EVALUATION

December	January	February	March	April	May	June
Develop proposal and budget, submit for consideration to Dr. G. Thompson/ F.L.P.C.	Design Instruments Field Test	Questionnaire Data Collection Students/Grads	Follow-up Interviews	Data Collection Analysis		Final Report
	Expert Evaluation of Materials.	Instructor's Focus Group Interviews	Academic/ Interviews	Preliminary Findings		
	Line Administration Interviews					

INDEX

Abraham, Nancy, 223, 236, 240
Academic Credit, Standards, 196-197
Administrators, Summer Sessions, Ch. 4
  Education and Experience, 98-100
  Other Duties, 101
  Powers and Functions, 102-103
  Problems, 105-106, 231-232
  Source, 80
  Time Allocations, 80, 100
Adult Education Act, 53
Adult Education, 51-55
Agassiz, Louis, 38
Alberta, University of, 157-158, 234-235
Alumni Colleges, 129
American Association of Higher Education, 247, 253
American Council on Education, 224
American Federation of Teachers, 62, 269
American Library Association, 28
American University, 129
American Summer Sessions Senate, 222-226
  Institutes, 223-224
  Purposes, 223-224
Applbaum, Ronald L., 19
Arizona State University, 223
Association of University Summer Sessions, 15, 17, 203-209, 221
  Constitution, 208
  Original Members Invited, 204
  Representatives First Meeting, 205
Association of University and Colleges of Canada, 226
Avent, Joseph H., 17
Babcock, K. C., 205
Barak, Robert J., 247
Barnard, Henry, 32
Belle, Robert L., 18
Bernstein, Melvin, 233
Blendinger, Jack, 215
Bloom, Arnold M., 122
Bowdoin College, 130
Brigham Young University, 113
Bristol, George, 204
Brown University, 33
Budget for Summer Sessions
  Administration, 96-98
  Research and Scholarships, 84
  Self-Support, 83, 92-94
  Student Fees, 83
Calendar, Academic, Ch. 8
  Changing-Problems and Requirements, 190-191
  Credit Ratio Standards, 196-197
  Historical Background, 182-183
  Means of Implementing Education Policy, 181
  Rationale for Year-Round, 188-190
  Relationship to Summer Session, 193-194
California State College-Los Angeles, 213
California, University of-Los Angeles, 236
California, University of-San Diego, 239
Canadian Association of Departments of Extension and Summer Schools, 226-227
Carswell, Lloyd, 234
Carter, James O., 30
Case Western Reserve, 129
Catholic Summer School of America, 40
Catholic University of America, 30
Central Missouri State University, 237, 239
Chautauqua, 34-36, 39, 44
Chicago, University of, 29, 30, 41, 204, 260
Clark University, 34, 187
Cobb, Larry, 236
Collective Bargaining, 62-64, 175
College des Jesuites, 27
College Faculty Development Programs, 130
Colorado, University of, 207, 209
Columbia University, 130, 205
Compulsory Education Legislation, 55
Connecticut College, 235, 236
Conrad, Clifton, 253
Continuing Education/Community Service, 6-7, 131
Cook, Katherine M., 60
Cornell University, 33
Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 130
Courter, John F., 14
Coyne, Leslie J., 19, 234, 236, 239
Creativity in Programming, 135-136, 215
Cronbach, Lee J., 249
Cross, K. Patricia, 254
Cundiff, Edward W., 18
Curriculum, Summer Sessions
Creativity in Programming, 135-136
Minority and Disadvantaged, 124
Non-Traditional Class Activities, 132
Novel Features, 111-117
Offerings in the 1960s, 117-119
Program Characteristics, 120-122
Special Purpose Activities, 124
Trends, 134
Dankworth, Richard, 214
Dartmouth College, 188
Deal, William M. Jr., 19
Demographic Changes, 47
Denver, University of, 213

Dewey, John, 56
Dickerman, Watson B., 17
Dryness, Enock, 218
Economic Opportunity Act, 54
Educational Reform
  Committee on College Entrance Requirements, 56
  Committee of Fifteen, 56
  Committee of Ten, 56
  Committee on the Economy of Time, 56-57
  Structural Reorganization, 56
Educational Trends, 48-50
Edwards, Willard, 213
Elderhostel, 128
Eliot, Charles W., 37
El-Khawas, Elaine, 249
Enrollments, Fall-Summer Relationships, 149-152
Evaluation, Ch. 11
  Concepts of, 250-252
  Design, 265-266
  Information Retrieval or Generation, 266-267
  Interpretation-Reporting, 268-269
  Models, 260-262
  Move Towards Assessment, 251-252
  Plan of Operation, 264
  Process, 260, 263-265
  Purposes of, 254-257
  Standards, 269
Extended Education, 4
Extension, 4, 28-29
Faculty, Summer, Ch. 7
  Basis for Salary, 173
  Morale, 175-176
  Motivation for Summer Work, 171-172
  Perceptions About Summer, 171-172
  Profiles, 168-170
  Qualifications, 163-166
  Remuneration, 172-173
  Salary Structures, 174-175
  Selection, 170
Fallon, Jerome A., 17
Florida State University System, 149
Frazier, Benjamin W., 60
Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, 253
George Peabody College for Teachers, 207
George, Richard J., 19
George Washington University, 18
Georgia, University of, 187
Gjerde, Clayton, 215
Goodnight, S. H., 205
Goucher College, 129
Griffin, Kenneth, 235-236
Hall, Samuel R., 30
Harper, William R., 29, 41
Harris, William T., 28
Harvard College, 27, 39-42, 248
Hatch Act, 28
Heidenreich, Charles A., 18
Himes, Ellvert, 214
Hines, Clarence, 213
Holmes Group, 66
Hooten, David E., 19
Hutchings, Pat, 252-253
Idaho State University, 234, 237
Illinois State University, 240
Illinois, University of, 27
Indiana University, 27, 33, 39, 236, 239
Iowa, University of, 27, 33
Jewish Chautauqua, 40
Johns Hopkins University, 34, 187
Judd, Cornelius D., 17
Judson, Harry Pratt, 205
Kalamazoo Decision, 26
Kellogg Foundation, 130
Kigin, Denis, 215, 223
Kneerim, Lee W., 235, 239
Kraus, Edward H., 203
Latin Grammar School, 26
Law, Myrle, 215
Library Service Act, 54
Linscheid, A., 57
Little, John R., 211, 214
Lyceum, 34, 35, 37, 42
MaCleay, William B. III, 18
McCandless, Charles E., 18
McConaughy, J. L., 205
McDougall, William P., 9, 15, 19, 20
McGill, E. C., 19
McKenna, David L., 188
McLeRoy, Thomas S., 235
McNeil, Mellicent, 57
Mann, Horace, 33
Manual Labor Movement, 27
Marsh, Gerald, 209
Martha's Vineyard Summer Institute, 40
Marts, Marion, 209, 226
Martin, Reverend M. B., 218
Maryland, University of, 221, 233
Mauch, Jack, 234, 238
May, Russell A., 17
Miami University, 149
Michigan State College of Agriculture, 28
Michigan State Normal School, 34

Michigan, University of, 112, 187, 204, 210, 260
Miller, John E., 18
Minnesota, University of, 145, 154, 155, 187
Moe, Dick, 237
Morrill Act, 28
Morton, John, 213
Mount Union College, 39
National Council of Urban Education, 63
National Education Association, 37, 64, 187, 269
National, University of, 20
National Teachers Association, 37
National University Continuing Education Association, 20
Nebraska, University of, 18
Nelson, Michael U., 19
New Mexico University, 218
New York University, 33, 205
Normal Schools, 30-32
North American Association of Summer Sessions, 9, 18, 19, 221-225
North Carolina State University, 157
North Carolina, University of, 235
North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges, 38, 260
North Central Conference on Summer Schools, 18, 218-221, 225
  Activities, 219-221
  Founding, 218
  Nature of Organization, 218-219
Northwestern University, 260
Oberlin College, 27
Ohio State University, 207
Oklahoma, University of, 207
Oregon, University of, 207, 213
Owen, William, 213
Pacific Lutheran University, 237
Parker, Francis, 56
Peirce, Cyrus, 31
Penders, Gary, 236, 237, 240
Pennsylvania State University, 157
Peterson, Dean A., 213
Pittsburgh, University of, 207
Purdue University, 210
Randall, Ruth E., 18
Rensselaer School, 27
Reuben, Elaine, 252
Richmond, University of, 123
Richey, Robert, 209
Ried, Harold, 218
Ritchie, Linda C., 18
Rossman, Jack E., 249
Saint Joseph's College, 19
Saint Louis University, 218
Sakamaki, Shunzo, 214
Salisbury, Rollin D., 205
Sampson, Harold P., 237, 239
San Diego State University, 236
San Fernando Valley State College, 213
Schmitz, Neil, 209
Schoenfeld, Clarence A., 1, 70, 209, 222
Seagren, Alan T., 18
Selsky, Joel M., 18
Shimer College, 129
Shroder, Edward F., 18
Silliman, Benjamin, 28
Simpkins, Karen, 237
Slate, Joe H., 18
Smith, Clodus R., 221
South Alabama, University of, 18
Southern California, University of, 129
Sprague, Homer B., 40
State University of New York, 5, 124
Stickler, Hugh, 187
Students, Summer Session, Ch. 6
  In Selected Universities, 152-155
  Level of Work, 145
  Reasons for Attendance, 146-148
Stufflebeam, Daniel L., 269
Summer Sessions
  Advisory Committees, 81
  Associations, Professional, Ch. 9
  Curriculums, Ch. 5
  Faculty, Ch. 7
  Finance, 82-84, 91-96, 235-236
  Growth, 67-74
  Impacted by Educational Trends, 54-55
  Issues, 233-237
  Objectives, 12-17
  Operating Policies and Procedures, 85
  Organization and Administration, Ch. 4
  Organizational Structures, 7-8, 88-90, 236
  Philosophical Moorings, 85, 234-235
  Problems, 105-107, 231-233
  Program Characteristics, 120-122
  Programming Mode of Operation, 90
  Prospects, 72-74, 243-244
  Purposes, 16, 17, 86-88
  Relationship to Collegiate Calendar, 193-194
  Relationship to Institutional Goals, 10-11
  Relationships to Cont'd Educ/Community Service, 5-6, 9
  Relationships to Extension, 4, 7
  Research About, 17-20
  Students, Ch. 6
  Teacher Education Influences, 55, 67

  Trends, 237-240
  Views About, 3-4
Syracuse University, 18
Tarbet, Donald G., 235
Teacher Education, 30-33, 55-59, 64-66
  Certification and Licensure, 59-62
  Impact on Summer Sessions, 64-66
  Quality of in Early 1900s, 57-59
Teachers Institutes, 32
Thompson, Ronald B., 19
Thompson, Willard, 226
Thorndike, Edward L., 57
Tyler, Ralph, 261
United States Military Academy, 27
Utah State University, 214
Utah, University of, 215
Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act, 69
Virginia, University of, 39, 147, 155
Warn, Jill, 239
Warren, Helen, 20
Washington College, 33
Washington State University, 152-154, 257
Watkins, Lloyd, 240
Wells, Jackson, 213
Western Association of Summer Session
  Administrators, 9, 18, 210-217, 221
  Administrative Workshops, 216
  Beginnings, 210
  Creative Programming Awards, 216
  Formal Organization, 213-215
  Program Emphases Since 1970, 216-217
Wheaton College, 218
Wichita State University, 129
Willard, Emma, 27
Wilson, Richard F., 253
Wisconsin, University of-Madison, 18, 33,
  40, 147, 155, 156, 204, 205, 236
Wisconsin, University of-Whitewater, 239
Wyoming, University of, 235, 239
Young, Raymond J., 9, 15, 19, 20
Zillman, Ronald N., 1